

THE CAMBRIDGE
HISTORY OF

TURKEY

VOLUME 1

Byzantium to Turkey

1071–1453

EDITED BY
KATE FLEET

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF
TURKEY

*

Volume I of *The Cambridge History of Turkey* examines the rise of Turkish power in Anatolia from the arrival of the first Turks at the end of the eleventh century to the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453. Taking the period as a whole, rather than dividing it along the more usual pre-Ottoman/Ottoman fault line, the volume covers the political, economic, social, intellectual and cultural history of the region as the Byzantine Empire crumbled and Anatolia passed into Turkish control to become the heartland of the Ottoman Empire. In this way, the contributors to the volume engage with and emphasise the continuities of the era rather than its dislocations, situating Anatolia within its geographic context at the crossroads of Central Asia, the Middle East and the Mediterranean. The world which emerges is one of military encounter, but also of cultural co-habitation, intellectual and diplomatic exchange, and political finesse. This is a state-of-the-art work of reference on an understudied period in Turkish history by some of the leading scholars in the field.

KATE FLEET is Director of the Skilliter Centre for Ottoman Studies, Newnham College, Cambridge, and Newton Trust Lecturer in Ottoman History at the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, Cambridge University. Her previous publications include *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State* (1999) and, as joint-editor, *The Ottomans and Trade* (2006).

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF

TURKEY

Founding editor

I. METIN KUNT, *Professor of History, Sabancı University*

The Cambridge History of Turkey represents a monumental enterprise. The History, comprising four volumes, covers the period from the end of the eleventh century, with the arrival of the Turks in Anatolia, through the emergence of the early Ottoman state, and its development into a powerful empire in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, encompassing a massive territory from the borders of Iran in the east, to Hungary in the west, and North Africa and the Arabian Peninsula in the south. The last volume covers its destruction in the aftermath of the First World War, and the history of the modern state of Turkey which arose from the ashes of empire. Chapters from an international team of contributors reflect the very significant advances that have taken place in Ottoman history and Turkish studies in recent years.

VOLUME 1

Byzantium to Turkey, 1071–1453

Edited by Kate Fleet

VOLUME 2

The Ottoman Empire as a World Power, 1453–1603

Edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi and Kate Fleet

VOLUME 3

The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603–1839

Edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi

VOLUME 4

Turkey in the Modern World

Edited by Reşat Kasaba

THE CAMBRIDGE
HISTORY OF
TURKEY

★

VOLUME I
Byzantium to Turkey, 1071–1453

★

Edited by
KATE FLEET



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi
Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521620932

© Cambridge University Press 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2009

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Byzantium to Turkey, 1071–1453 / edited by Kate Fleet.
p. cm. – (The Cambridge history of Turkey ; v. 1)
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-62093-2 (hardback)

1. Turkey – History – To 1453. I. Fleet, Kate.

DR481.B98 2008

956.1'014 – dc22 2008035737

ISBN 978-0-521-62093-2 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

- *List of illustrations* ix
- *List of maps* x
- *List of contributors* xi
- *A note on transliteration* xiii
- *Chronology* xiv

- 1 · Introduction 1

KATE FLEET

- 2 · The Byzantine Empire from the eleventh to the fifteenth century 6

JULIAN CHRYSOSTOMIDES

- 3 · Anatolia under the Mongols 51

CHARLES MELVILLE

- 4 · Anatolia, 1300–1451 102

RUDI PAUL LINDNER

- 5 · The incorporation of the Balkans into the Ottoman Empire,

1353–1453 138

MACHIEL KIEL

- 6 · Ottoman warfare, 1300–1453 192

PÁL FODOR

- 7 · The Turkish economy, 1071–1453 227

KATE FLEET

Contents

· 8 · Art and architecture, 1300–1453 266

HOWARD CRANE

· 9 · Social, cultural and intellectual life, 1071–1453 353

AHMET YAŞAR OCAK

· Glossary 423

· Bibliography 429

· Index 482

Illustrations

8.1 Plan of Bursa in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries	page 275
8.2 İlyas Bey Camii, Balat (Miletus), plan and view of north façade	280
8.3 Yeşil Cami, İznik, plan and view from north-west	282
8.4 Ulu Cami, Ermenak, plan and view of prayer hall interior along <i>kible</i> wall	284
8.5 İsa Bey Camii, Ayasoluk, plan and view from south	285
8.6 Sungur Bey Camii, Niğde, plan and view of north portal	287
8.7 Ulu Cami, Bursa, plan and interior of prayer hall	289
8.8 İlyas Bey Camii, Manisa, plan and view of prayer hall interior	291
8.9 Üç Şerefeli Cami, Edirne, plan and view of covering showing arrangement of prayer hall domes	293
8.10 Yeşil complex, Bursa, site plan and view of south-west exterior of mosque	296
8.11 Hatuniye Medrese, Karaman, plan, view of portal and view of courtyard	299
8.12 Vacidiye Medresesi, Kütahya, plan and view of courtyard and <i>eyvan</i>	301
8.13 Haliliye Medresesi, Gümüş, Merzifon, plan	303
8.14 Muradiye Medresesi, Bursa, plan	304
8.15 Hüdavend Hatun Türbesi, Niğde, general view	307
8.16 Aşık Paşa Türbesi, Kırşehir, general view	309
8.17 Taşkın Paşa Sarayı, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp, plan and general view	312
8.18 Issız Han, Ulubad, plan and general view of entry façade	315
8.19 <i>İskendername</i> , dated 819/1416	323
8.20 Muradiye, Edirne, detail of <i>kalem işi</i>	325
8.21 Konya carpet (TIEM 688), c.1300	330
8.22 Niccolo di Buonacorso, <i>Marriage of the Virgin</i> (c.1370), with Anatolian animal carpet	332
8.23 Animal carpet with struggling dragon and phoenix, c.1400	334
8.24 Proto-Holbein carpet from Beyşehir	337
8.25 <i>Mihrab</i> , Ulu Cami of Birgi	339
8.26 Yeşil Türbe, Bursa, general view of exterior	341
8.27 <i>Mihrab</i> and cenotaph, Yeşil Türbe, Bursa	342
8.28 Muradiye, Edirne, detail of dado	344
8.29 <i>Minber</i> bone inlay, Taşkın Paşa Camii, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp	349
8.30 <i>Kündekari</i> wooden door, Yeşil Türbe, Bursa	350

Maps

1	The Byzantine Empire, 1071	<i>page</i> xvii
2	Beylik Anatolia	xviii
3	The Ottoman Empire, 1453	xix

Contributors

JULIAN CHRYSOSTOMIDES is the Director of the Hellenic Institute, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London and is Emerita Reader in Byzantine History at the University of London. Her books include *Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore: Manuel II Palaeologos* (Thessalonike, 1985) and *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Documents for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries* (Camberley, 1995).

HOWARD CRANE is a Professor in the Department of the History of Art at Ohio State University. His books include *The Garden of Mosques: Hafiz Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayi's Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul* (Leiden, 2000) and *Risale-i Mi'mariyye: an Early Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Treatise on Architecture* (Leiden, 1987).

KATE FLEET is the Director of the Skilliter Centre for Ottoman Studies, Newnham College, Cambridge and is Newton Trust Lecturer in Ottoman History at the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge. Her books include *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1999).

PÁL FODOR is Head of the Department of the Early Modern Age at the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He has published extensively on the military and administrative organisation and the ruling elite of the Ottoman state as well as on Ottoman political relations with Europe. His books include *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire* (Istanbul, 2000), and *'Affairs of State are Supreme': the Orders of the Ottoman Imperial Council Pertaining to Hungary (1544–1545, 1552)* (Budapest, 2005), which he co-authored with Géza Dávid, with whom he has also co-edited several collections of articles on Ottoman–European relations.

MACHIEL KIEL was Director of the Netherlands Archaeological Institute in Istanbul. He is Adviser to UNESCO for Bosnia-Herzegovina and lectures on Islamic Architecture at İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi. He has also worked for eighteen years as a builder and stone cutter at the Dutch Service for Historical Monuments, thus combining academic study with work in the archives and practical experience in building. He has written extensively on the Ottoman Balkans and his books include *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (Aldershot, 1990).

List of contributors

RUDI PAUL LINDNER is Professor of History at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, where he teaches comparative medieval history and the history of astrophysics. He has published on the history of steppe nomads, early Ottoman historiography, medieval monetary history and the development of astronomical institutions in the twentieth-century USA. His books include *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington, 1983) and *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Bloomington, 2006).

CHARLES MELVILLE is Reader in Persian History at the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge. His books include *A History of Persian Earthquakes* (Cambridge, 1982), which he co-authored with N. N. Ambraseys and *The Seismicity of Egypt, Arabia and the Red Sea: a Historical Review* (Cambridge, 1994) (with N. N. Ambraseys and R. D. Adams).

AHMET YAŞAR OCAK is a Professor in the Department of History at Hacettepe Üniversitesi. His work is on Seljuk and Ottoman social, cultural and religious history and his extensive publications include *Babaîler İsyanı: Alevîliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı Yahut Anadolu'da İslâm-Türk Heterodoksisinin Teşekkülü* (Istanbul, 2000), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Marjinal Süfîlik: Kalenderîler* (Ankara, 1999), *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler Yahut Dairenin Dışına Çıkanlar*, 3rd edn (Istanbul, 2003), *Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslâm'ın Balkanlardaki Destani Öncüsü*, (Ankara, 2002) and *Kültür Tarihi Kaynağı Olarak Menâkıbnâmeler: Metodolojik Bir Yaklaşım* (Ankara, 1997).

A note on transliteration

Ottoman Turkish has been transliterated using modern Turkish orthography, and diacritical marking of long vowels has not been used for Arabic and Persian terms or names. Names have been given in their Turkish form except when in common usage in English. Where figures are more familiar under a different form, both forms are given.

Chronology

Seljuks

1063–72	Alp Arslan
1071	Battle of Malazgirt (Manzikert)
1081–92	Süleyman I
1092–1107	Kılıç Arslan I
1107–16	Melikşah
1116–56	Rükneddin Mesud I
1156–92	Kılıç Arslan II
1192–6, 1204–10	Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I
1196–1204	Rükneddin Süleyman II
1204–5	İzzeddin Kılıç Arslan III
1210–20	İzzeddin Keykavus I
1220–37	Alaeddin Keykubad I
1237–43	Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II
1243	Battle of Köseadağ
1246–48	İzzeddin Keykavus II
1248–65	Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV
1249–57	Alaeddin Keykubad II
1265–83	Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III
1283–4, 1284–93, 1294–1301, 1303–7	Gıyaseddin Mesud II
1284, 1292–3, 1301–3	Alaeddin Keykubad III
1307	Gıyaseddin Mesud III

Ilkhans

1253–65	Hülegü
1265–82	Abaqa
1282–4	Ahmad Tegüder
1284–91	Arghun
1291–5	Geyhatu
1295	Baidu
1295–1304	Ghazan

Chronology

1304–16
1317–35

Öljeitü
Abu Sa'id

Beyliks

Latter part 13th century

Foundation of the beyliks

?–c.1324

Osman

c.1324–62

Orhan

1326

Fall of Bursa to the Ottomans

1331

Fall of Nikaia (İzmit) to the Ottomans

1337

Fall of Nikomedia (İzmit) to the Ottomans

c.mid-1330s

Ottoman conquest of Karası

1344

Crusader force partially occupied İzmir

1354

Ottoman occupation of Gelibolu (Callipolis)

1362–89

Murad I

c.1369

Fall of Adrianople (Edirne) to the Ottomans

1371

Battle of Çirmen on the Maritsa (Meriç)

1370s

Ottoman conquest of Germiyan and Hamid

1380s

Ottoman conquest of Teke

1385

Fall of Niš to the Ottomans

1387

Fall of Thessalonike to the Ottomans

1389

Battle of Kosovo

1389–1402

Bayezid I

1389–90

Ottoman conquest of Aydın and Menteşe

1394–1402

Siege of Constantinople by the Ottomans

1396

Battle of Nikopolis

1397

Ottoman defeat of Karaman

1402

Battle of Ankara

1402–13

Period of internecine fighting among the Ottomans

1413–21

Mehmed I

1416

Revolt of Şeyh Bedreddin and Börklüce Mustafa

1421–44, 1446–51

Murad II

1422

Siege of Constantinople by the Ottomans

1430

Fall of Thessalonike to the Ottomans

1444

Battle of Varna

1444–6, 1451–81

Mehmed II

1448

Second battle of Kosovo

1453

Ottoman conquest of Constantinople

Byzantium

1071–8

Michael VII Doukas

1078–81

Nikephoros III Botaneiates

Chronology

1081–1118	Alexios I Komnenos
1118–43	John II Komnenos
1143–80	Manuel I Komnenos
1180–3	Alexios II Komnenos
1183–5	Andronikos I Komnenos
1185–95, 1203–4	Isakios II Angelos
1195–1203	Alexios III Angelos
1203–4	Isakios II Angelos and Alexios IV Angelos
1204	Alexios V Doukas
	Fall of Constantinople to the fourth crusade
1204–61	Latin kingdom of Constantinople
1204–1461	Latin kingdom of Trebizond
1204–22	Theodore I Laskaris
1222–54	John III Doukas Vatatzes
1254–8	Theodore II Laskaris
1258–9	John IV Laskaris
1259–82	Michael VIII Palaeologos
1282–1328	Andronikos II Palaeologos
1328–41	Andronikos III Palaeologos
1341–91	John V Palaeologos
1341–7	Civil war in Byzantium
1347–54	John VI Kantakouzenos
1373–6	Manuel II Palaeologos
1376–9	Andronikos IV Palaeologos
1391–1425	Manuel II Palaeologos
1425–48	John VIII Palaeologos
1448–53	Constantine XI Palaeologos



Map 1 The Byzantine Empire, 1071



Map 2 Beylik Anatolia



Map 3 The Ottoman Empire, 1453

Introduction

KATE FLEET

This first volume of *The Cambridge History of Turkey* considers the transition period from the arrival of the Turks in Anatolia to the collapse of the Byzantine Empire and the creation of an Ottoman Empire with its imperial capital of Istanbul. The first four chapters examine various aspects of the political history of the period: the history of Byzantium, the Mongol period in Anatolia, the Turkish advance into Europe and the rise of the Turkish states, including that of the Ottomans. The following four chapters deal with various aspects of the social and economic life of the period, focusing on the military, the economy, art and architecture, and the cultural and religious milieu of this world of transition from Byzantium to Ottoman Empire.

The defeat in August 1071 of the Byzantine emperor Romanos Diogenes by the Turkomans at the battle of Malazgirt (Manzikert) is taken as a turning point in the history of Anatolia and the Byzantine Empire. From this time the Byzantines were unable to stem the flow of the Turks into Anatolia and the slow process of Turkification had begun. But it was not a battle of conquest, as both Julian Chrysostomides (p. 10) and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (p. 356) point out in this volume. The Seljuk ruler Alp Arslan was intending not to conquer Anatolia, but rather to move against Syria and Egypt. This was not the first Turkish appearance in the region and Byzantine Anatolia had already been weakened before the battle of Malazgirt by many years of Turkoman raiding.

In the same way as 1071 has become a seminal (and useful) date for historians, so too has the date of 1453 when the Byzantine capital, Constantinople, fell to the Ottoman ruler Mehmed II and the Byzantine Empire ceased to exist. This date has been taken to symbolise the beginning of the imperial power of the Ottoman Empire, the creation of an imperial capital and the commencement of true Ottoman might. It was not, of course, quite like that. The Byzantine Empire had been crumbling slowly for a considerable period well before 1453, and by that date had been reduced merely to the capital and a small strip of territory around it. The city had undergone Ottoman sieges before, under

Bayezid I in the 1390s and again under Murad II in 1422. Its conquest, however, created shockwaves across the western world. Many believed it presaged the arrival of the Turks in Rome itself, and the extirpation of the Christian faith. For the Ottomans, the capture of the capital of the Byzantine Empire was symbolically significant. Further, the location of the city, controlling the crossing between east and west, and the waterway between north and south, between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, made it economically and strategically important for a state which had territory in both Asia and Europe. Its fall did not, however, represent any sudden or dramatic departure from Turkish policy but was a continuation in the development of the Ottoman state in line with the fall of Byzantine cities before it, such as Thessalonike in 1430.

Both 1071 and 1453, therefore, are dates whose significance as crucial moments in history is overplayed. They are, however, convenient signifiers of periods of change and transformation in directions of events in history and as such make useful starting and end points for this volume.

One date that is largely ignored by the periodisation of this volume is the turn of the fourteenth century, taken as the notional starting point of the Ottoman state. This has certain advantages. It does not overplay history in favour of the ultimate winners, the Ottomans, and thus tries to avoid seeing history backwards when outcomes are known. The Ottomans tend to dominate studies of the later part of this period, as a result of the fact that they came out on top. But, as Rudi Paul Lindner points out, there was no way that this could have been foreseen in 1300 (Lindner, p. 102), or, one might add, in 1402 after the devastating defeat at the battle of Ankara when Ottoman forces were crushed by Timur and the Ottoman state plunged into a period of internecine warfare. The ignoring of 1300 as a turning point date also allows a greater appreciation of this period as one of slow transformation marked by fluidity and fusion rather than in stark terms of collisions and sudden change. This is a period in which the region passes from an Orthodox, Byzantine empire to an Ottoman, Muslim one. It is characterised by gradual assimilation, adaptation and absorption and is marked by a high degree of flexibility and fusion of cultures. Such fusion is evident in the intellectual world of the period, the literature, art and architecture, and in the make-up of the Turkish states.

This was a world of intellectual mobility, dynamism and cosmopolitanism, as is clearly to be seen in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak's discussion of the intellectual and cultural aspects of the period (chapter 9). Intellectuals and ideas were drawn from outside the region into the courts of the new Turkish states. What was to develop from this fusion of Central Asian, Middle Eastern and Byzantine elements was a distinctly Turkish intellectual world expressed in a Turkish

which was to become the Ottoman language of the empire. 'The intellectual world of medieval Turkey', as Ocak notes, 'created the bases of the intellectual performance of the Ottoman Empire for centuries to come' (Ocak, p. 422).

Such fusion of diverse elements is reflected also in art and architecture, the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth being a period of significant transformation in Turkish art and architecture which shows the continuation of Rum Seljuk influences in central and eastern Anatolia while, particularly in western Anatolia, there was a considerable departure from tradition, drawing on diverse sources including late Byzantine, Timurid and Mamluk art (Crane, p. 266). But there was also a mix, with Seljuk-influenced buildings appearing in the west and innovative ones being built in the central regions (Crane, p. 279).

This amalgamation of different influences is clearly evident in the make-up of Ottoman society. As Pál Fodor demonstrates, the early Ottoman military organisation was an amalgam of Turkoman, Seljuk, Ilkhanid and Byzantine elements (p. 192), with a considerable contribution from the Byzantines, the Venetians and the Genoese to the development of the Ottoman navy (Fodor, p. 224). Despite the general view that the Turks were not seafarers, they in fact took early, and successfully, to the water.

Flexibility and the ability to adopt, absorb and use outside sources was a significant factor in Turkish success, particular in that of the Ottomans. One of the elements accounting for the Ottomans' development of 'one of the best war machines of the age' was that 'they had the necessary ability and readiness to accommodate foreign technologies and experts and to take part in international trade and transfer of knowledge and weapons' (Fodor, p. 226). This ability to utilise foreigners and benefit from outside expertise is also evident in Turkish economic practice (Fleet, p. 258)

One of the problems facing research on the economy, and indeed on most aspects of the period, is the lack of sources (Ocak, p. 353, Fleet, pp. 228–9). This has resulted in a dearth of research in many areas, or the establishment of views which need to be reassessed. Thus, for example, the idea that the Turks lacked economic motivation or acumen, although now firmly under attack, has yet finally to be put to rest. Historians have often portrayed the period from 1071 to the fall of Constantinople as one of destruction. It is certainly the case that there was much devastation inflicted on the region by a variety of forces: the crusaders, the Turkomans, the Mongols, the Mamluks and Timur. But this does not mean, and could not logically mean for Anatolia over the whole four-hundred-year period, blanket and continuous devastation. The Mongols, as Charles Melville points out, have often come out of the history of Anatolia

rather badly (Melville, p. 51). Either overlooked in a seamless progression from Seljuk to Ottoman, or viewed as a brief preamble to Ottoman history, they have frequently failed to feature large for historians of Turkish Anatolia. For historians of the Ilkhans, their Anatolian phase has often not featured at all. As Melville argues, there needs to be more work on assessing the Mongol contribution to the history of Anatolia, and on what impact Mongol practices had on the development of Turkish, in particular Ottoman, government, on the extent to which the Ilkhans simply adopted the Seljuk practices they found in place and what elements they introduced from their steppe background. Ilkhan financial practices did affect the development of administration under the Ottomans who adopted accounting methods from them and imitated their coins.

More research is also needed on the organisation and functioning of the *medreses*, research into which is only in its initial phase (Ocak, p. 412), on Shi'ism in Anatolia and on the role of conversion and apostasy, an area in which emotive rather than objective history has been influential (Ocak, p. 403). The Turkish presence in Europe is another area where emotive response has far too often warped historical analysis. Despite the attitude that the Turks 'came last and consequently, when the nation-states were set up, had to go first' (Kiel, p. 138), Machiel Kiel demonstrates that contacts between the various Turkic peoples and the Balkans go back at least as far as the settlement of the Slavs (Kiel, p. 138). It is odd that the Ottomans, who were established on European soil from the mid-fourteenth century, should have been so vehemently rejected as a European power when, in Kiel's estimation, 'the land to the East of the line from Nikopol (Nikopolis, Niğbolu) on the Danube to Kavala on the Aegean, and most of the southern half of Macedonia was, until 1912, at least as "Turkish" as most of Anatolia' (Kiel, p. 156). Destruction of Ottoman monuments in the Balkans has been a concrete expression of the rewriting of the history of the region in the twentieth century which has so coloured and distorted research.

The history of this period has frequently been viewed through the mirror of the modern age. The rise of Turkish power in Anatolia and the Balkans has been interpreted by many historians in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries under the all-powerful shadow of the nation-state which has so often sought to model history in its own image. British historians have been befogged by the miasma of philhellenism, Balkan historians intellectually trammelled by the Ottoman yoke which for many lay heavily across both their lands and their mental outlooks, Turkish historians ensnared in the requirements of 'Turkishness'. On many occasions views have been adopted 'as the result either of conscious

prejudice or of innocent superficiality of conviction', in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak's phrase, referring specifically to the assessment of the Turks who arrived in Anatolia as primitive, adopted by older-generation western historians (Ocak, p. 400). It is to be hoped that this volume will contribute to a clearer conception of the period and that it will encourage the conduct of research outside the constriction of the political requirements of any particular age.

The period 1071–1453, thus, is one in which much stays the same, much changes slowly, and much emerges new from a chrysalis-like fusion of cultures. By 1453 the world of Anatolia and much of the Balkans had become a Turkish, Muslim one, and the world of Byzantium was gone.

The Byzantine Empire from the eleventh to the fifteenth century

JULIAN CHRYSOSTOMIDES

The defeat of the Byzantine army by the Seljuk Turks at the battle of Malazgirt (Manzikert) in 1071 ushered in a period of military decline, which, despite its fluctuations, culminated with the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453. This event brought to an end an empire, which, despite the ethnic, linguistic and religious varieties existing within its borders, in essence had maintained its Graeco-Roman and Christian culture and tradition.¹

Originally the eastern half (*pars orientalis*) of the Roman Empire, Byzantium had throughout its existence to defend its territories against forces that rose in the east, west and north. As a result of the migrations of the Germanic tribes, the western half was lost to the empire by the end of the fifth century, despite the subsequent attempts by Justinian I (527–65) to re-conquer these territories. Yet, as long as the empire held on to Asia Minor, its wealthiest province after Egypt in terms of men and resources, it had the possibility of reasserting itself, first against the Persians and later against the Arabs, despite the loss of North Africa, Egypt, Syria and Palestine.

The migrations of various tribes from Asia brought additional pressure to bear on the empire's northern frontiers. Of these, the most serious in this period were those of the Slavs, the Bulgars of Turkic origin, and the half-Slavicised Sarmatian peoples, namely the Serbs and Croats. Slav pressure on the northern frontier was resolved by a political decision. Unable militarily to contain them beyond the Danube frontier and put an end to their attacks, the Byzantines settled the Slavs in depopulated areas of the empire, including Asia Minor,² as they did with the Armenians.³ Both these solutions proved to be

1 For the ethnography of Byzantine Asia Minor, see S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, Calif., 1971), pp. 42–68.

2 P. Lemerle, 'Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIII^e siècle', *Revue Historique* 211–12 (1954), 265–308.

3 P. Charanis, 'Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959), 25–44.

economically and militarily to the empire's advantage. On the other hand, the defeat of the Avars in Pannonia by Charlemagne's son Pippin in 796 made it possible for the Bulgars to move westward and become a major threat to the empire.

The Arab pressure brought to bear on the eastern frontier led to the reorganisation of the provinces, known as the 'theme system', which involved settling troops (*themes*) in districts under the administration and the supreme authority of a *strategos* (general), who combined both military and civil authority and was directly responsible to the emperor. This system, which was developed and extended to territories as they were reincorporated within the frontiers of the empire, not only played a part in the recruitment of a loyal army but in addition protected the existence of a free peasantry which contributed both militarily and economically, and enabled the empire to ward off its enemies both in the Balkans and in the east.⁴ Similarly, the problems created in the north, first by the migratory Slav and later Bulgar peoples, were checked to some extent by the use of military force coupled with diplomacy entailing both religious and cultural influence.

By the eighth century the Byzantine Empire had successfully defended Constantinople against the Arabs and the Slavs, and consolidated its rule in Asia Minor. By the middle of the ninth century it had made such a remarkable recovery that it was able to take the offensive in all directions, in the west, in the Balkans and in the east. Following a series of military victories, the Byzantines began by the tenth century to penetrate well into Arab territory, thus initiating a period of expansion on all fronts, including the recapture of the islands of Crete (961) and Cyprus (965). These military achievements reached their apogee in the reign of Basil II (976–1025). In southern Italy, Calabria and Apulia were once more under the firm control of the empire, while in the north, with the conquest of Bulgaria, its frontiers extended to the Danube and the Drava. In the east, with the annexation of Ani and later of Vaspurkan, ceded to the empire by its king who was unable to defend his lands against the incursions of the Turks, the empire's frontiers extended eastward of Lake Van and beyond the Euphrates.⁵ At the close of Basil II's reign in 1025 the Byzantine

4 P. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Galway, 1979).

5 For the social problems created by this expansion, see G. Dagron, 'Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: l'immigration syrienne', *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976), 177–216; N. Oikonomides, 'L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe–XIe siècles et le Taktikon de l'Escorial', in *XIe Congrès international des études byzantines: rapports*, II (Bucharest, 1974), pp. 285–302; S. Der Nersessian, 'The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia', in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. II, ed. K. M. Setton (Madison, 1969), pp. 630–59.

Empire had emerged as the dominant power in the eastern Mediterranean, and succeeded in drawing within its sphere of influence the Slavs of the Balkans and Russia.

These achievements could not have been accomplished without a degree of continuity in the policies of the emperors who had ruled the empire during this period, nor without a well-structured political, military and economic organisation. The years that immediately followed Basil II's death were not entirely devoid of success, but as time went on the lack of a leadership capable of assessing and responding to military and social problems aggravated the situation. The position deteriorated further with the clash between the civil aristocracy in the court of Constantinople and the large landowners of Asia Minor who had provided military leadership but had also profited economically from the eastern expansion. Their drive to absorb both the land and the free small landholders after Basil II's death remained unchecked. In addition, the centralisation initiated under Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55) weakened both the military and naval structures of the empire, for these changes not only affected the economic welfare of the state owing to the loss of revenue from taxation, but also deprived the state of its soldiers.⁶

In addition to the internal difficulties, the empire had as a result of its expansion to face new forces along its frontiers. The most formidable of these were the Normans in the west, the Pechenegs in the north and the Seljuks in the east, the last two being of Turkic origin. The Pechenegs were not unknown to the Byzantines, for they had succeeded in establishing a working relation with them for a long time and used them to control the Russians, Magyars and Bulgars, as becomes clear from the advice given by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (905–59) to his son Romanos:

So long as the emperor of the Romans is at peace with the Pechenegs, neither Russians nor Turks can come upon the Roman dominions by force of arms, nor can they exact from the Romans large and inflated sums in money and goods for the price of peace . . . To the Bulgarians also the emperor of the Romans will appear more formidable, and can impose on them the need for tranquillity, if he is at peace with the Pechenegs.⁷

This situation was fundamentally altered after Basil II's death (1025). The annexation of Bulgaria exposed the empire to the Pecheneg raids, which

6 P. Charanis, 'Economic Factors in the Decline of the Byzantine Empire', *The Journal of Economic History* 13 (1953), 412–24.

7 Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. and tr. Gy. Moravcsik and R. H. J. Jenkins (Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, 1967), pp. 50–3, lines 4–5.

left devastation in their wake.⁸ Despite periodic agreements, such accords did not last long and the Pechenegs remained a constant threat. Far more destructive, however, proved to be the Uzes, another nomadic Turkic tribe which crossed the Danube in 1065 and reached Thessalonike, penetrating into Greece, ravaging the countryside and killing the inhabitants.⁹ In Asia Minor a new foe appeared on the scene, the Seljuk Turks, who proved to be even more formidable. The annexation of Armenia during the reigns of Basil II and Constantine IX Monomachos exposed the empire to Seljuk incursions.¹⁰ These coincided with the social and economic changes taking place within the empire that were to affect its military potential. Michael Psellos's discerning remark, put in the mouth of Isakios I Komnenos, that 'imperialist policy . . . could not be effected without much expenditure of money and men, as well as sufficient reserve' was confirmed by subsequent events,¹¹ for Constantine IX's decision to disband the thematic armies of Iberia and Mesopotamia, and to impose taxation in place of military service, forced large sections of the population to desert to the enemy.¹² The running down of the theme system in this particular case was not a one-off decision but a policy which was applied to the rest of the empire and resulted in the undermining of the social and economic structures upon which its military and naval strength was based.¹³ The resulting vacuum in the defence sector was filled by the large-scale recruitment of foreign mercenaries, with specific taxes being raised for this purpose.¹⁴ These measures not only were a drain on the treasury, but also aggravated the situation by provoking armed rebellions at a time when cities and countryside were devastated by enemy attacks.¹⁵

8 John Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. Thurn (Berlin and New York, 1973), p. 373 § 2.

9 Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. with Spanish tr., I. Pérez Martín (Madrid, 2002), p. 63.

10 For the question of the rise of the Seljuk Turks, see C. Cahen, 'La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure', *Byzantion* 18 (1948), 15; P. Wittek, 'Deux chapitres de l'histoire des Turcs de Roum', *Byzantion* 11 (1936), 285–302.

11 Michael Psellos, *Chronographie*, vol. II, ed. and tr. E. Renauld. (Paris, 1926), p. 114; English tr. E. R. A. Sewter, *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers* (London, 1966), p. 306.

12 Kekaumenos, *Strategicon*, ed. B. Wassiliewsky and V. Jernstedt (St Petersburg, 1896; repr. 1965), p. 18; Attaleiates, *Historia*, p. 34; Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, p. 476 § 29; Michael Glykas, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1836), p. 598; Joannes Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, vol. III, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst (Bonn, 1897), p. 647; H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre. La politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris, 1966), pp. 146–7.

13 Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 151, 159–63.

14 P. Lemerle, André Guillou and Nicolas Svoronos (eds.), *Actes de Lavra. Edition diplomatique*, vol. I: *Des origines à 1240* (Paris, 1970), part 2, no. 33, p. 198, lines 81–3: εἰσπράξεως βαράγγων, πῶς ἡ Σαρακηνῶν ἢ Φράγγων ἢ ἑτέρων τινῶν ἐθνικῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων; P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Paris, 1977), p. 271.

15 In 1054 Artze, a major commercial centre, was razed to the ground by Ertuğrul: Attaleiates, *Historia*, p. 148; Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, pp. 451–3; Matthew of Edessa,

In 1068, during the minority of Michael VII Doukas, the son of Constantine X Doukas (1059–67), Romanos Diogenes, a professional soldier, was chosen as emperor. The need for a military man to counter enemy attacks was apparent at least to the dowager empress, Eudocia, whose choice he was.¹⁶ The newly appointed emperor, a member of the military party, hurriedly collected a motley army, mainly consisting of Pechenegs, Uzès, Normans and Franks, each contingent obeying the orders of its own leader. At a crucial stage he split his forces, sending a contingent of his most experienced soldiers to invest Chliat (Ahlat) on Lake Van.¹⁷ But above all, it was the betrayal of Andronikos Doukas, Michael's cousin and son of the caesar, John Doukas, who spread false rumours during the engagement that Diogenes had been defeated, which undermined the whole venture. This led to a large section of the Uzès changing sides and joining their fellow Turks,¹⁸ while the Franks, under Roussel of Bailleul, and the Armenians, resentful of Byzantine religious pressure, fled the camp. Andronikos Doukas, most probably with a view to ousting Diogenes, withdrew from the battlefield and headed with his army to Constantinople.¹⁹ The result was the Byzantine defeat and the capture of Diogenes. The Turkish sultan, Alp Arslan (1063–72), seems at this stage not to have been interested in proceeding with the conquest of Anatolia, his main concern being to move his forces against Syria and Egypt.²⁰ He therefore treated Diogenes honourably and agreed to release him on condition that the Byzantines paid an annual tribute and provided military help.²¹ But the powers in Constantinople, primarily John Doukas, rejected the agreement, the empress was removed to a nunnery and Michael VII was proclaimed sole emperor (1071–8).²² In response, Diogenes sought Alp Arslan's help to regain his throne. Defeated,

The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa, tr. A. E. Dostourian (New York and London, 1993), pp. 76–7; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 85–96.

¹⁶ Psellos, *Chronographie*, II, pp. 155–6 (Sewter, pp. 348–9).

¹⁷ Attaleiates, *Historia*, p. 112; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 98–103, cf. C. Cahen 'La campagne de Mantzikert d'après les sources musulmanes', *Byzantion* 9 (1934), 629–631. Cf. Vryonis's important critique of Cahen's article on his interpretation of Byzantine sources, *Decline*, pp. 100–1 n. 109. Contrary to the Muslim sources. Skylitzes states that the Byzantine army was ill equipped: *Continuatus*, ed. E. T. Tsolakes, *Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς Χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτζη* (Thessalonike, 1968), pp. 125 ff.

¹⁸ Attaleiates, *Historia*, pp. 117–18, states that he personally administered the oath κατὰ τὸ πάτριον to the Uzès who had remained loyal.

¹⁹ Attaleiates, *Historia*, pp. 120–1; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, p. 701; B. Leib, 'Jean Doukas, César et moine, son jeu politique à Byzance de 1067 à 1081', *Mélanges P. Peeters*, vol. II, *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), pp. 163–80.

²⁰ Cahen, 'La campagne de Mantzikert', p. 623.

²¹ Attaleiates, *Historia*, pp. 122–3; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, pp. 702–3; cf. Psellos, *Chronographie*, II, vii, p. 164 (Sewter, pp. 357–8).

²² Attaleiates, *Historia*, p. 125; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, p. 704.

he was blinded despite the assurances given him to the contrary, and died soon after.²³ Using Diogenes's death as an excuse, Alp Arslan directed his forces against Asia Minor, the defences of which had already been eroded by the incursions and pillaging of the independent Turkish bands (Turkomans) during the preceding decades.²⁴

These events unfolding in the east had their counterpart in the west. The same year that witnessed the disaster of Malazgirt (Manzikert) also saw the fall of Bari, the last Byzantine possession, to the Normans under Robert Guiscard, whose target became the imperial possessions on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, and ultimately Constantinople. Similarly, the Byzantines lost ground in the Balkans where they suffered repeated insurrections.²⁵ But above all, what eroded the remaining strength of the empire from within were the various rebellions of both pretenders and foreign mercenaries, such, for example, as that of Roussel of Bailleul who revolted in the name of John Doukas.²⁶ In order to suppress these rebellions the Byzantine government had to call in Turkish mercenaries, thus aggravating the situation further and inadvertently assisting the Turkish expansion into Byzantine territory.²⁷ By 1180 the Sultanate of Rum (based on Roman territory) had arisen on Byzantine soil, extending from Cilicia to the Hellespont, thus bringing to a close the imperial presence in the heart of Asia Minor.²⁸

The dynasty of the Komnenoi and their successors, 1081–1204

Meanwhile, a series of insurrections brought to power first Nikephoros III Botaneiates in 1078 and, three years later, Alexios I Komnenos, who found 'an empire surrounded on all sides by barbarians' and a depleted treasury.²⁹

23 Attaleiates, *Historia*, pp. 122 ff.; Nikephoros Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. and tr. P. Gautier (Brussels, 1975), pp. 136–41; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, p. 705.

24 Attaleiates, *Historia*, p. 136: οἱ δὲ Τοῦρκοι τὴν ἐξῶν ἔκτοτε κατέτρεχον ὁδεῶς; Bryennios, *Histoire*, pp. 144–5; Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, p. 24; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 110–12. On the Turkomans, see P. Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident: recherches sur 'La geste d'Umur Pacha'* (Paris, 1957), p. 12; Wittek, 'Deux chapitres', 302–319.

25 On this see G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, tr. J. M. Hussey (Oxford, 1968), p. 359 nn. 2, 3 with bibliography cited.

26 Attaleiates, *Historia*, pp. 138–9; Bryennios, *Histoire*, pp. 176–9.

27 Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 108–10.

28 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, ed. and tr. B. Leib, 3 vols. (Paris, 1965), I, i, p. 18; translated by E. R. A. Sewter as *The Alexiad* (London, 1969), p. 38; Cahen, 'Première pénétration', 5 ff.; Wittek, 'Deux chapitres', 296–301.

29 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, vi, p. 47 (Sewter, p. 185); P. Gautier, 'Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis Ier Comnène', *Revue des Études Byzantines* 28 (1970), 34–5. On Alexios see P. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ier Comnène* (Paris, 1900).

His immediate task was to introduce reforms which gathered civil authority and military power in the hands of an officer, the *katepano*, in charge of a region, and in addition to bring in further tax impositions to build up the army.³⁰ In a climate of rivalries and rebellions Alexios strengthened his position by extensive land grants and titles to his family and partisans, a policy that often elicited criticism.³¹ This solution, though perhaps inevitable, was indeed a double-edged sword, for while it strengthened his authority, at the same time it encouraged separatist elements. In addition, it further undermined the agrarian structures that up to the early eleventh century had been responsible for the economic and military strength of the empire. An astute politician, Alexios tried to resolve the immense problems facing him by having recourse to both diplomacy and war. He opened negotiations with Pope Gregory VII and the German emperor, and secured the naval support of Venice during Robert Guiscard's blockade of Dyrrachium (Durazzo).³² Although in 1082 Venetian help was bought at a high price, for it involved granting them extensive quarters and commercial privileges³³ which in the long run were to prove detrimental to the empire, nevertheless for the time being the Norman defeat gave them a respite, particularly when the Slavs in the Balkans took advantage of the Norman invasion to assert their independence.

The pressure from the western front, but above all the continuous lack of resources in both cash and manpower, forced Alexios to concentrate on recovering coastal territories, realising that any attempt to regain lands within the heart of Anatolia, fragmented by the constant devastating raids of the Turkomans and parcelled out among the Turkish beys, would have necessitated a considerable military force that was an impossibility in the present

30 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, III, xiv, pp. 144, 154–5, 186 (Sewter, pp. 437, 445); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 222–5.

31 Gautier, 'Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite', pp. 28–9, 40–43; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, III, pp. 766–7, about Alexios I: 'he performed his functions not as public or state ones, and he considered himself not a ruler, but a lord, conceiving and calling the empire his own house . . .'

32 For the decline of the Byzantine navy in this period see Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 179–84.

33 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, vi, pp. 54–5 (Sewter, p. 191); G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, vol. I (Vienna, 1856), no. 23, pp. 51–4; new edition by M. Pozza and G. Ravagnani, *I trattati con Bisanzio, 992–1198* (Venice, 1993), no. 2, pp. 36–45. For the empire and Venice throughout this period, see F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge* (Paris, 1959), pp. 36–9; D. Jacoby, 'Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: a Reconsideration', *Anuario de estudios medievales* 24 (1994), 349–69; repr. in Jacoby, *Trade Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Aldershot, 1997), xi; D. Jacoby, 'The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople from 1082–1261: Topographical Considerations', in *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. C. Sode and S. Takács (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 153–9, 160–8.

circumstances, a problem, in fact, that remained unresolved also under his successors. The loss of Asia Minor, the richest province of the empire in both men and resources, inevitably deprived the rulers of any possibility of reclaiming the lost territories through concerted campaigns. All that Alexios could do for the moment was to give instructions to the governors of towns, along both the Black Sea and Paphlagonia, bypassed by the Turks, to remain at their post and defend their areas,³⁴ a policy which in certain cases, for example Trebizond (Trabzon), proved successful.³⁵ These measures, further strengthened and developed by Alexios's successors, led to the revival of the theme system. At the head of each theme, either land or maritime, there was a governor, now called *dux*, with both military and civil functions. These administrative areas, however, were in size a mere shadow of their predecessors.³⁶

Alexios's immediate concern was the recovery of the territories adjacent to the coast of the Propontis from marauding Turks, who, at the time established in Nicaea (İznik), then under Süleyman (1077/8–86), raided the countryside of Bithynia as far as Damalis on the Bosphorus. Though Alexios did succeed in relieving these areas and pushing the Turks further inland, he had no other alternative but to conclude an armistice with Süleyman.³⁷ This was not a long-term solution, for at the sultan's death his domains were divided among the emirs he had left in charge, one of them being Çaka (Tzachas), who, some years earlier, had been taken prisoner in one of the Turkish raids and presented to Emperor Nicephoros Botaneiates (1078–81), who honoured him with the title *nobelissimus*. However, having lost his position on the accession of Alexios Komnenos, Çaka set out on a venture of creating his own state and assuming the title of emperor. Taking advantage of the attacks of the Pechenegs in the outskirts of Constantinople in 1090–1, he succeeded with the help of a local Greek in building a navy and seizing islands and towns fringing the coast, including Mitylene and Chios.³⁸ Once Alexios had resolved the problem of the Pechenegs with the help of the Cumans, another nomadic tribe, which

34 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, I, iii, p. 131 (Sewter, p. 125).

35 An example of this was Gavras in Trebizond: A. Bryer, 'A Byzantine Family the Gabrades, c. 979–c. 1653', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1970), 164–87.

36 H. Glykatzis-Ahrweiler, 'Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX–XIe siècles', *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique* 84 (1960), 62–5; Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 222–3.

37 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, I, iii, p. 138 (Sewter, pp. 129–30).

38 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, vii, p. 110. (Sewter, p. 233); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 184–9. The title *protonobelissimus* at least until the middle of the eleventh century was reserved for the imperial family: N. Oikonomides (ed.), *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris, 1972), p. 293. On Çaka see A. N. Kurat, 'Çaka Bey: İzmir ve Civarındaki Adaların İlk Türk Beyi, M.S. 1081–1095' (Ankara, 1966); C. M. Brand, 'The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh–Twelfth Centuries', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 43 (1989), 2–3.

decimated them at the battle of Levounion,³⁹ he turned his attention to Çaka and the rebuilding of the imperial navy. The ships the emperor had at his disposal could not match those commanded by Çaka and any attempt to tackle him at sea remained unsuccessful. The problem was finally resolved when Alexios entered into an alliance with Çaka's son-in-law, Kılıç Arslan I (1092–1107), who supposedly eliminated him after a banquet.⁴⁰ Meanwhile, Alexios had succeeded in rebuilding the navy which dealt successfully with the insurrections of Crete and Cyprus.⁴¹

These successes coincided with the launching by Urban II at the Council of Clermont (1095) of the first crusade for the liberation of the Holy Land from the Muslims.⁴² The outcome was that, instead of the western mercenaries the emperor had appealed for, and had used in the past, he had to face the arrival of multitudes of unarmed pilgrims or armed contingents that added to the already existing pressures.⁴³ The demand made on logistics, involving transport, provisioning and policing the crowds, often undisciplined and destructive, was immense. Nevertheless, Alexios succeeded in controlling the situation, demanding an oath from the leaders that whatever areas they conquered which had once belonged to the Roman Empire would be restored to Byzantium.⁴⁴ His insistence on this oath has been interpreted by some modern historians as a ploy to turn the crusaders into his vassals. However, using a western convention was the only way available to him of exerting control over the crusaders who presented a potential threat.⁴⁵ In return, he promised to assist them in their march, providing them with essential supplies and guides. This co-operation reached its climax with the capture of Nicaea (İznik) and the

39 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, viii, p. 143 (Sewter, p. 258).

40 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, ix, p. 165 (Sewter, p. 274).

41 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, ix, pp. 162–4 (Sewter, pp. 272–4).

42 P. Lemerle, 'Byzance et la croisade: l'idée de croisade', in *Relazioni del X congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* 3 (Florence, 1955), p. 595; repr. in Lemerle, *Le monde de Byzance: histoire et institutions* (Aldershot, 1978), VIII; J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), pp. 21–5.

43 Chalandon, *Essai*, pp. 155 ff. On this see also D. C. Munro, 'Did the Emperor Alexius I Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza 1095?', *American Historical Review* 27 (1922), 731–3; Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, pp. 12 ff. For Alexios's need for mercenaries see Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, vii, p. 105 (Sewter, p. 22).

44 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, II, x, pp. 225–6, 228–9 (Sewter, pp. 319, 322–5). Bernold reports that those who went on the crusade had 'to take an oath to obey the emperor': F. Duncalf, 'The Councils of Piacenza and Clermont', in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. I (Madison, 1969), ch. 8, p. 256; R.-J. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States (1096–1204)*, tr. J. C. Morris and J. F. Ridings (Oxford, 1993), p. 8 n. 34 citing the latest bibliography on the subject; see also chs. 1 and 2.

45 He was prepared to accept a modified oath, as in the case of Raymond of St Gilles: R. Hill (ed. and tr.), *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* (London, 1962), vi, p. 13.

march through Cappadocia.⁴⁶ By the time the crusaders had reached Antioch, however, the complications had increased. Stephen of Blois's desertion and his report to the emperor at Philomelion (Akşehir) that the crusaders were facing complete collapse, in addition to the rumours that Turkish forces were trying to overtake the emperor before he could reach Antioch, left Alexios with no alternative but to beat a retreat. At this moment the safety of the empire was paramount. Henceforth, thanks to Bohemond of Antioch's manipulations, any possibility of co-operation had ended.⁴⁷ His subsequent attack on the empire and his final defeat at Dyrrachium (Durazzo), followed by his submission, albeit nominal, in September 1108 under the treaty of Devol,⁴⁸ enhanced the prestige of Alexios who now turned his attention to the Balkans. Aware of Hungary's importance as a political factor in both the Balkans and the Adriatic, he had arranged the marriage of his son and heir, John, to a Hungarian princess (1104), an alliance that consolidated Byzantine–Hungarian relations at least during his reign. But above all, Alexios succeeded in strengthening imperial authority and recovering some lost territory. The frontier in the Balkans extended as far as Belgrade in the north, to Scodra (Shkodra) in the south, including Kotor, Dubrovnik and Ragusa, and in the north-east it followed the river Danube to the Black Sea. In the south in Asia Minor the frontier stretched from the river Meander (Büyük Menderes) to Philomelion (Akşehir) as far as Ancyra (Ankara) and then veered to the east along the Black Sea as far as Trapezous (Trebizond, Trabzon). It was this legacy that Alexios left to his successors at his death in 1118.

His son, John II (1118–43), considered by Niketas Choniates as the greatest of the Komnenoi, continued his father's policies with determination and prudence.⁴⁹ The main problems he had to face in the west, particularly in the early part of his reign, were his relations with Hungary and its rising influence in the Balkans and the Adriatic. In the east the recovery of lands in Anatolia from the Turks, the Armenians in Cilicia, the Norman principality of Antioch and its links with Sicily occupied him throughout his reign. His decision, on the advice of his finance counsellor, to run down on grounds of economy the

46 *Gesta Francorum*, xi, pp. 25–7.

47 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, iii, xi, pp. 20, 48; xii, pp. 53–6, 78–85 (Sewter, pp. 343, 365, 369–71, 388–94); cf. *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 34–5, 44–5, 63.

48 Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, iii, xiii, pp. 125–39 (Sewter, pp. 424–34). The treaty was rejected by Tancred, who seized Antioch after Bohemond's death (iii, xiv, p. 146; Sewter, p. 438).

49 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1975), pp. 46–7; translated by H. J. Magoulias as *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates* (Detroit, 1984); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, p. 237; F. Chalandon, *Les Comnènes, études sur l'empire byzantin aux XIe–XIIe siècles*: Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel Comnène (1143–1180) (Paris, 1912).

fleet that his father had reorganised was a serious mistake. This 'ill-advised policy or pennypinching', as Choniates notes, resulted in the control of the seas passing into the hands of the pirates.⁵⁰

In addition to these problems, a fresh horde of Pechenegs crossed the Danube in 1122 and pillaged imperial lands as far south as Thrace and Macedonia, although they then suffered a crushing defeat by the Byzantine army. Following his father's policy John settled those Pechenegs who survived the battle on imperial lands and drafted them into the Byzantine army. This event put an end once and for all to their marauding activities.⁵¹

John, however, failed to extricate himself from the extensive commercial privileges granted to the Venetians by his father in 1082 which were strangling the Byzantine economy. Forced by gunboat diplomacy involving attacks on Corfu, Cephalonia, Lesbos (Mitylene), Chios and Rhodes, and with his naval force reduced, he had no alternative but to renew and extend their privileges in 1126.⁵² Unable to free himself from Venetian economic dominance in the empire, he tried to encourage the Pisans by renewing in 1136 the more limited privileges his father had once granted them,⁵³ though at the time Pisa could hardly compete with Venice. On the other hand, as a counterpoise to Norman expansion under Roger II of Sicily, who had united Sicily and Apulia under his rule and had crowned himself emperor in 1130, John sought a rapprochement with the German rulers and the papacy.

Following his successful encounter with Hungary over Serbia around 1130, John was finally able to turn his attention to the east. He conducted campaigns against the Turks in Bithynia, Pamphylia, Phrygia, Galatia and Paphlagonia and constructed fortresses to stem the Turkish expansion.⁵⁴ His objective was the recovery of Antioch, then under the regency of Jocelin I of Courtenay. Judging that the Sultanate of Rum was at the time going through internal dissensions, the emperor moved his forces against the emirate of the Danişmends of Malatya (Melitene), which he defeated in 1135. The road to Syria, however,

50 Choniates, *Historia*, 1, pp. 54–5 (Magoulas, pp. 32–3); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, p. 230.

51 Choniates, *Historia*, 1, pp. 13–16 (Magoulas, pp. 10–11).

52 John Kinnamos, *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome Rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), p. 281; translated by C. M. Brand as *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus* (New York, 1976), p. 210; Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, 1, no. 43, p. 96; Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, no. 3, pp. 51–6.

53 G. Müller, *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente* (Florence, 1879), pp. 43–5; F. Miklosich and I. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, vol. III (Vienna, 1865), no. 3, pp. 9 ff.

54 Kinnamos, *Epitome*, pp. 5 ff. (Brand, pp. 14 ff.); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 227–8; H. Glykatzis-Ahrweiler, 'Les fortresses construites en Asie Mineure face à l'invasion seldjoudide', *Akten des internationalen Byzantinisten Kongresses* (Munich, 1958), pp. 182–9; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 116–18.

was barred by the kingdom of Lesser Armenia, established in Cilicia sometime around 1071 by refugees from Armenia proper fleeing before the Turks.⁵⁵ Since that time, Lesser Armenia had extended its territory at the expense of Byzantium and had established good relations with the Latin rulers in the east. In the spring of 1137 John moved his forces to capture Tarsus, Adana and Mamistra (Misis) in quick succession. By August he had reached Antioch which surrendered after a short siege. Raymond of Poitiers, husband of Constance of Antioch, daughter of Bohemond II, swore allegiance to the emperor and recognised the suzerainty of the empire. A year later John made a solemn entry into Antioch. This victory was short lived. The Latins withdrew their support and the emperor had no alternative but to leave Antioch. Whether he was planning to establish for his son Manuel, as Kinnamos states, a frontier principality consisting of Attaleia (Antalya), Antioch and Cyprus which would have provided more effective defence is difficult to tell.⁵⁶ At any rate, contrary to the perception of the west that accepting the status quo would best serve the interests of his people,⁵⁷ John, as he wrote to King Fulk of Jerusalem, had no intention of relinquishing his aim of taking control of Antioch and extending his authority to the south.⁵⁸ These designs, however, were never fulfilled for he died in the spring of 1143. His third son and successor, Manuel I (1143–80), continued his plans and those of his grandfather, though his approach differed in conformity with the changing circumstances.

The developments in the west and in particular the Norman expansion in the Mediterranean forced Manuel to strengthen his alliance with the German king, Conrad III (1138–52), whose sister-in-law, Bertha of Sulzbach, he married in compliance with his father's earlier arrangements. These projects of co-operation between the two rulers were placed in jeopardy by the second crusade, sparked off by the capture of Edessa by the Muslims in 1144. This undertaking brought together not only the French and Norman kings, Louis VII (1137–80) and Roger II of Sicily (1130–54), but also Conrad, thus depriving Manuel of his ally in the west. The very aims of the crusade of strengthening the Latin principalities, including Antioch, ran counter to Manuel's aspirations of bringing them under at least nominal imperial authority and putting an end to the hostilities. In fact at the time Raymond of Antioch,

55 Oikonomides, 'L'organisation de la frontière orientale', pp. 285–302; Der Nersessian, 'Kingdom', pp. 630–59.

56 Kinnamos, *Epitome*, p. 23 (Brand, p. 26); see P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 40.

57 Peter the Venerable, *The Letters*, vol. I, ed. G. Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 208–9.

58 Kinnamos, *Epitome*, pp. 16, 23 (Brand, pp. 22, 25); Magdalino, *Manuel*, pp. 36–7.

far from seeking co-operation, was harassing Cilician cities subject to the Romans.⁵⁹

While Manuel was dealing with the passage of the crusaders, a task wrought with difficulties similar to those confronted by his grandfather Alexios I with the first crusade,⁶⁰ Roger's objective was to attack the empire and capture Constantinople.⁶¹ In April 1147 he seized Corfu, Thebes and Corinth, the last two being the wealthiest silk-manufacturing cities of Greece.⁶² The Norman hostilities inevitably diverted Manuel's attention from east to west. As the leader of a Mediterranean power, Manuel had no alternative but to defend its interests both in Sicily and in southern Italy. With the help of Venice he succeeded in recapturing Corfu. In appreciation of their services Manuel renewed the Venetian privileges in 1147 and a year later extended their quarters.⁶³ However, his lengthy confrontation with the Normans not only proved too costly for the imperial resources but also went counter to the interests of the Venetians who proceeded to mend their relations with the Normans.⁶⁴ The situation was further complicated by Roger's stirring up of the Hungarians and Serbs against the empire. Conrad's death in February 1152 undermined the plan for a concerted Italian campaign. The new German king, Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–90), unlike his predecessor, never concluded an agreement with Manuel. Apart from the political interests, what exacerbated the situation was Frederick's claims to imperial sovereignty which carried with it universal dimensions, a concept which ran counter to Byzantine tenets. As a result of these complications Manuel's Italian campaign, far from being successful, had ended with the Byzantine defeat at Brindisi in 1156 and the loss of the conquered territory. The emperor had no alternative but to come to terms with Roger's successor, William I (1154–66), through the mediation of Pope Hadrian IV in 1158.⁶⁵ The same year saw the culmination of Manuel's policy towards the Latin

59 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 5 (Magoulias, p. 31).

60 Manuel I's letters to Pope Eugenius III (1145–53), stipulating the same conditions which Alexios had set out: V. Grumel, 'Au seuil de la deuxième croisade. Deux lettres de Manuel Comnène au Pape', *Études Byzantines* 3 (1945), 143–67; cf. Lemerle's criticisms in 'Byzance et la croisade', p. 605 n. 2.

61 According to Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and tr. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948), pp. 12–13, 26–7, 58–9, Roger's plans were thwarted by the French knights and Conrad III; see also Magdalino, *Manuel*, pp. 49–51.

62 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 72–6, 98 (Magoulias, pp. 43–5, 57); see Chalandon, *Les Comnènes*, II, pp. 317 ff.; Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicilie*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907), II, pp. 136 ff. for the silk workers.

63 Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, no. 51, pp. 114–24 (year to be corrected to 1147), no. 50, pp. 109–13; Pozza and Ravegnani, *Trattati*, nos. 4–5, pp. 60–75. See also Andrea Dandolo, *Cronaca*, ed. E. Pastorello (Bologna, 1938), pp. 242–3.

64 Dandolo, *Cronaca*, pp. 247–9. 65 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 97 (Magoulias, p. 56).

principalities when Byzantine suzerainty was recognised by both Reynald of Antioch and King Baldwin of Jerusalem.⁶⁶

Manuel's relations with Venice, on the other hand, deteriorated, and as a counterpoise Manuel concluded alliances with both Pisa and Genoa,⁶⁷ though these two city-states could hardly redress the balance. In addition, the growing Genoese commercial activity proved an irritant to the Venetians to the extent that in 1162, with the complicity of the Pisans, they attacked and destroyed the Genoese headquarters.⁶⁸ Refusing to pay indemnities to the Genoese, and to subscribe to his Italian policy, as Manuel insisted, the Venetians were expelled from the empire and their property confiscated in 1171, while the Genoese privileges were extended.⁶⁹ In retaliation, the Venetians launched an attack and pillaged the Aegean islands, but failed to hold on to Chios, chased by the Byzantine fleet as far as Cape Malea. With the Byzantine fleet unable to proceed any further, it became clear that only through diplomacy could the hostility be resolved, particularly as Venice had concluded an alliance with Barbarossa against Ancona in 1173, and an agreement in 1175 with William II of Sicily (1166–89), who recognised Venetian commercial activities in the Adriatic.⁷⁰ The Veneto-Byzantine negotiations were concluded in 1179 with the renewal of the Venetian privileges, the release of prisoners, the restitution of sequestered property and the promise of reimbursement of damages inflicted on them in 1171.⁷¹ Yet, the Venetians do not seem to have hastened to return to Constantinople. Whether this was a consequence of Manuel's prevarication in paying damages, or their reluctance to return, is difficult to tell.

However, the insoluble problem, despite the progress made by the Komnenoi, remained Asia Minor.⁷² The very nature of the conquest, with its multifarious elements devoid of a single authority able to impose control and establish law and order, brought upheaval and desolation. Though Byzantium had secured the coastal areas from the Black Sea in the north as far as Laodikeia (Denizli) in the south and had reconquered the western part of the Anatolian plateau as far as Amorion (Hisar near Emirdağ), the forays for

66 Kinnamos, *Epitome*, p. 186 (Brand, p. 142).

67 Michel Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIIe-début du XVe siècle)*, 2 vols. (Genoa and Paris, 1978), I, pp. 20 ff.

68 Caffaro, *Annali genovesi*, vol. I, ed. L. T. Belgrano, in *Fonti della storia d'Italia*, vol. II (Genoa, 1890), pp. 67–8.

69 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 171–4 (Magoulias, pp. 97–8); Kinnamos, *Epitome*, pp. 282–6 (Brand, pp. 211–14); C. Imperiale (ed.), *Codice diplomatico della repubblica di Genova*, vol. II (Rome, 1938), no. 50, pp. 104–16, no. 52, pp. 117–21, no. 53, pp. 121–3; Thiriet, *Romanie*, p. 51.

70 Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, no. 65, pp. 172–5; Thiriet, *Romanie*, p. 53.

71 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 173–4 (Magoulias, p. 98).

72 On this see Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 115–18.

plunder into Byzantine territory, particularly by the Turkomans, continued unabated, despite the existing agreements.⁷³ The only respite in some cases came as a result of fortifications, built for example in Chliara (Kırkağaç), Pergamon (Bergama) and Atramyttion (Edremit), thus enabling the return of the population to pursue, as Choniates puts it, 'the good things of civilized life'.⁷⁴

In 1175 came the break between Constantinople and Ikonion (Konya) that led to Manuel's expedition against Kılıç Arslan II (1156–92) the following year and his defeat at Myriokephalon – a defeat that the emperor himself considered comparable to that of Malazgirt (Manzikert) a century earlier.⁷⁵ It soon became clear that the grandiose plans Manuel had embraced both in the west and east as a response to external circumstances could not be fully realised, for Byzantium at the time simply lacked the resources. As a consequence the alliances and agreements based on largesse entered into, in particular, with his eastern foes could not be maintained without military might to enforce them. The recruitment of mercenaries, both foreign and native, was not only a great burden to the exchequer but often resulted in the plunder and devastation of the provinces.⁷⁶

These weaknesses became apparent on Manuel's death in 1180 when his son, Alexios II, a minor, ascended the throne under the tutelage of his mother, Mary of Antioch. The interplay of a number of factors – resentment against the Latins, whose dominant position was more apparent under the regency, the power of the landed families, the abuse of tax-collectors and the poverty of the majority – led to a palace revolution, which spread to the people and brought to power Andronikos I Komnenos, Manuel's cousin, unleashing in these earlier stages a massacre of the Latins (1182).⁷⁷ A year later, having eliminated both Alexios and his mother, Andronikos was proclaimed emperor (1183–5).

A man full of contradictions, both brutal and humane, Andronikos introduced reforms and enforced the laws against abuse of power by the landed magnates, the sale of offices and the rapacity of tax-collectors, thus restoring a

73 For example, the treaties concluded first with the Seljuk ruler Mesud I in 1134 and later with Kılıç Arslan II (1156–92) in 1161: Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 19–20, 122–4 (Magoulias, pp. 12–13, 69–70). For the destructiveness of the Turkomans, see George Akropolites, *Opera*, vol. I, ed. A. Heisenberg, revised P. Wirth (Stuttgart, 1978), § 65, p. 136; George Akropolites: *The History*, tr. Ruth Macrides (Oxford, 2007), p. 315.

74 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 150, line 41 (Magoulias, p. 85).

75 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 191 (Magoulias, p. 108). For Manuel's letter to Henry II Plantagenet describing these events, see A. A. Vasilev, 'Manuel Comnenus and Henry II Plantagenet', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929–30), pp. 237–40.

76 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 208–9 (Magoulias, pp. 118–19).

77 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 250–1 (Magoulias, pp. 140–1).

measure of prosperity to the provinces.⁷⁸ On the other hand, his ruthless character and irrational suspicions turned his rule into a reign of terror, thus ultimately alienating the powerful landed aristocracy on whose co-operation the defence of the empire rested. His external policy equally antagonised the western powers. The agreements that Manuel I had secured with so much effort were in tatters: Hungary occupied Dalmatia and parts of Croatia and Sirmium; the Serbs declared their independence and expanded their territory at the expense of Byzantium; while the Normans, having occupied Corfu (Kerkyra), Kephallonia and Zakynthos, sailed to Thessalonike which they sacked.⁷⁹

This external and internal disintegration led to the downfall of Andronikos and the Komnenian dynasty. The new occupant of the throne, Isakios II Angelos (1185–95), failed to deal with the developments in the Balkans and in particular Bulgaria, whose ruler, Asen, was crowned emperor of Bulgaria by the newly established archbishop of Trnovo in 1187. On the other hand, the Byzantines succeeded in ousting the Normans from Thessalonike and in coming to an agreement with Hungary. But the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (Salah al-Din) in 1187 and the launching of the third crusade in 1189 created fresh problems for the Byzantines. Of the leaders, Richard Lionheart and Philip II Augustus chose to sail to the east, while Frederick I Barbarossa opted for the land route through Asia Minor. To safeguard his passage he came to an understanding with both the Byzantines and the Seljuk ruler, Kılıç Arslan II, through whose lands he was to pass on his way to Jerusalem. This aroused Byzantine suspicions and led Isakios II to renew the alliance with Saladin made by Andronikos I.⁸⁰ However, despite Frederick's occupation of the Byzantine city of Philippopolis (Filibe, Plovdiv) and the verbal hostility between the two rulers which might have resulted in a German attack on Constantinople, a treaty was concluded in 1190 with the Byzantines promising the necessary provisioning in both victuals and transport.⁸¹ This venture not only failed to lead to the capture of Jerusalem, but proved detrimental to Byzantium when Richard Lionheart captured Cyprus,⁸² which was to remain in western hands.

78 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 324–6 (Magoulias, pp. 178–80); Eustathios of Thessalonike, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakides, tr. V. Rotolo, intro. B. Lavagnini (Palermo, 1961), pp. 14–15.

79 Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Espugnazione*, pp. 64 ff.; Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 296 ff. (Magoulias, pp. 164 ff.).

80 F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches 565–1453* (Munich, 2003), no. 1591, pp. 299–300; C. M. Brand, 'The Byzantines and Saladin, 1185–1192: Opponents of the Third Crusade', *Speculum* 37 (1962), 167–81.

81 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 402–4, 408–11 (Magoulias, pp. 221–2, 224–6).

82 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 418 (Magoulias, p. 229).

The internal abuses, the extortions of tax-collectors, the sale of offices and the extravagant expenditure seem to have continued unabated.⁸³ Nor did the situation improve under Isakios II's brother Alexios III Angelos who ousted him in 1195.⁸⁴ On the contrary, the dissension within the imperial family led to the final stages of the disintegration. The appeal by Isakios and his son Alexios to Philip of Swabia, whose brother had married Isakios's daughter, began a chain of events which under Venice's direction were to divert the fourth crusade from Egypt, first to Zara and then to Constantinople. These coincidences, underpinned by commercial interests, resulted in the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders and the division of the imperial lands among them. The idea had been contemplated in the past,⁸⁵ but as the possibility of a successful colonisation in Palestine and Syria grew more remote, the capture of Constantinople became a reality.

In July 1203 Alexios IV was crowned co-emperor when Isakios was restored to his throne but he was unable to fulfil his promises to the crusaders and make the necessary exorbitant payments. This led to the crusaders and Venice drawing up a treaty proposing the partition of the empire among themselves. This was put into practice when the people rebelled against Alexios IV for having subjected them to the Latins and brought Alexios V Doukas to the throne. On 13 April 1204 Constantinople fell to the crusaders, who unleashed a massacre, pillage and sheer wanton destruction that lasted for three days.⁸⁶ This destruction spread also to the provinces.

Latin rule and the Byzantine Empire in exile, 1204–61

Following the capture of Constantinople a new political order had to be established.⁸⁷ The leader who proved instrumental in implementing the agreement and manipulating the election of the emperor was Enrico Dandolo, the doge of Venice. Bypassing Boniface of Montferrat, the most eligible candidate,

83 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 444–5 (Magoulias, pp. 244–5).

84 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 483 ff. (Magoulias, pp. 265 ff.). 85 See above note 61.

86 Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, vol. II, ed. E. Faral (Paris, 1939), pp. 52–3; Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 571–6, 586–8 (Magoulias, pp. 314–15, 322–3); Nicholas Mesarites, *Der Epitaphios auf seinem Bruder Johannes*, ed. A. Heisenberg, in *Quellen und Studien zur spätbyzantinischen Geschichte* (Aldershot, 1973), pp. 16–72.

87 Villehardouin, *La conquête*, II, pp. 34–7; A. Carile, 'Partitio terrarum Imperii Romaniae', *Studi Veneziani* 7 (1965), 125–305; N. Oikonomides, 'La décomposition de l'empire Byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: à propos de la *Partitio Romaniae*', in *XVe congrès international des études byzantines: rapports et co-rapports*, vol. I (Athens, 1976), pp. 3–28; repr. in Oikonomides, *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade* (Aldershot, 1992), XX.

given his ability and Byzantine connections, Dandolo, with Venetian interests in mind, engineered the election of Count Baldwin of Flanders.⁸⁸ With the exception of the doge all other crusaders had to swear an oath of fealty to the emperor.⁸⁹ According to this agreement one-quarter of all imperial territory together with five-eighths of the capital were to be assigned to the emperor; one-quarter of the remaining territory, in addition to the remaining three-eighths of Constantinople, were granted to the Venetians.⁹⁰ The remainder of the territories was apportioned as fiefs to the knights. Apart from five-eighths of the capital, Baldwin received land in Thrace and in the north-west region of Asia Minor, his kingdom thus straddling the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. Boniface, displeased with the areas allocated to him, seized Thessalonike and established a kingdom there, and then set out to conquer Boeotia, Attica and the Peloponnese, granting suzerainty to various French leaders, who were to owe allegiance to him as king, and not to the emperor.⁹¹ Venice, aware of its military incapability to impose its rule on such an extensive area, relinquished the territories of Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia and the Peloponnese granted to it by the treaty, and restricted its rule to the two ports of Coron (Korone) and Modon (Methone) in the south-western tip of the Peloponnese. These were referred to as 'the right eye of Venice', for they controlled the routes to the Adriatic and southern Mediterranean.⁹² Venice also occupied other islands in the Ionian and the Aegean and bought Crete from Boniface of Montferrat. Of all the participants in the fourth crusade, Venice alone was gradually to establish a maritime empire in the eastern Mediterranean which was to last until the early years of the eighteenth century, in contrast to the transient presence of the rest of the crusaders.

As a result of the destruction of the central authority of Constantinople, three states arose competing for the political succession of Byzantium. Michael Angelos, with his capital at Arta, established his authority over Epirus, Acarnania and Aetolia as an independent political entity in opposition to the kingdom

88 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 596 (Magoulas, p. 328).

89 Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, 1, pp. 447–9.

90 D. Jacoby, 'The Venetian Government and Administration in Latin Constantinople in 1204–61: a State within a State', in *Quarta Crociata. Venezia – Bisanzio – Impero Latino*, eds. G. Ortali, G. Revegiani and P. Schreiner (Venice, 2006), pp. 19 ff.; Jacoby, 'The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople', pp. 160–8; Ch. Maltezou, 'Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli (scali marittimi)', *Θησαυρίσματα* 15 (1978), 30–61.

91 For the Latin principalities see A. Bon, *La Morée franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969).

92 J. Chrysostomides, *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Documents for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries* (Camberley, 1995) (hereafter MP), no. 26, p. 55, line 9: 'sunt oculus dexter Venetiarum'.

of Thessalonike, to the Venetians in the Adriatic and to the Slavs in the north. Shortly before the capture of the city the brothers Alexios and David Komnenos, grandsons of Andronikos I Komnenos, took possession of Trebizond (Trabzon). David went on subsequently to seize Sinope (Sinop) and extend his rule to Paphlagonia and the Pontic Heraclea. In Asia Minor a large section of the population, who had sought refuge there, rallied round Theodore Laskaris, a son-in-law of Alexios III Angelos. The Latin advance into Asia Minor against Laskaris was halted by the revolt of the Byzantine magnates of Thrace, whose offer of co-operation had been rejected by both Boniface and Baldwin. In the ensuing bloody revolt they called in the Bulgarian tsar, Kalojan, who invaded with his Cumans and defeated the crusaders near Adrianople (Edirne). Baldwin was taken prisoner and later died in captivity; a number of Frankish knights lost their lives, among them Louis of Blois, the claimant to Nicaea (İznik).⁹³

While the crusaders directed their interest to the European part of the territories, Theodore Laskaris established his rule in Nicaea and went on to reintroduce the imperial structures of both secular and ecclesiastical administration. Michael Autoreianos, a scholar, was elected patriarch of Constantinople in 1208 and proceeded to crown Laskaris emperor. Thus Nicaea was eventually to emerge as the legal and official Byzantine Empire in exile and as such it challenged the authority of the Latin rule in Constantinople.⁹⁴ Henry of Flanders, Baldwin's brother and successor, in contrast to earlier policy, adopted a conciliatory approach towards the Greeks and won a number of the Greek magnates to his rule. Though he opened hostilities against Nicaea, he was once more forced by the Bulgarian threat to conclude a two-year armistice with Theodore Laskaris in the spring of 1207. This gave Theodore a respite to concentrate on the task of imposing his authority on the centrifugal elements that sought to establish independent principalities.⁹⁵ One such rebel was Theodore Mangaphas who seized Philadelphia (Alaşehir), while Sabbas Asidenos captured the town of Sampson, near Miletus (Balat).⁹⁶ Manuel Mavrozomes, in co-operation with Keyhüsrev I (1204–10), the Seljuk leader, tried

93 Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 597 ff., 612–17 (Magoulas, pp. 328 ff., 335–7); Villehardouin, *La conquête*, II, p. 145.

94 Laskaris was seen as the only one capable of restoring the throne of Constantine the Great: Michael Choniates, *Τὰ σωζώμενα*, ed. Sp. Lampros, 2 vols. (Athens, 1880), II, pp. 149–52.

95 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 639, lines 79–83: οἱ δὲ εἰς δοξομανίαν ἑκτραχηλισθέντες . . . (Magoulas, p. 351); cf. George Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 7, p. 12 (Macrides, p. 120).

96 Theodore Mangaphas in Philadelphia (Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 400–1; Magoulas, p. 220). For Sabbas Asidenos, see P. Orgels, 'Sabbas Asidéno, dynaste de Sampson', *Byzantion* 10 (1935), 67–80.

to establish himself in the Meander valley. In this case, according to Choniates, Theodore Laskaris came to an agreement with Keyhüsrev and granted him a portion of the territory which included Chonai (Honas) and Phrygian Laodikeia (Denizli).⁹⁷ Despite these agreements, the Turks, intent on capturing the coastal regions, took advantage of the upheavals and seized a number of fortresses, including Attaleia (Antalya).⁹⁸ In addition, at the mediation of Venice, Keyhüsrev entered into a secret alliance with Henry in 1209,⁹⁹ and tried to elicit support among the Byzantines by championing the cause of Alexios III Angelos, Theodore's father-in-law, who had returned from the west and had taken refuge with the sultan. Hostilities continued round Antioch on the Meander with losses for the Nicaeans, but the sultan's defeat and death in 1211 removed for the time being the pressure on the eastern front, thus giving Theodore the opportunity to turn his attentions to the Latins. After the Byzantine victory on the Rhyndakos (Orhaneli) river in that year, Henry moved on to Pergamon (Bergama) and Nymphaion (Nif, now Kemalpaşazade). However, subsequent hostilities and skirmishes between the two forces proved both indecisive and draining, and in 1214 a treaty was concluded at Nymphaion between the two empires.¹⁰⁰ Relations between Nicaea and Constantinople remained friendly after Henry's death and in 1216 Theodore married Henry's niece as his third wife. Three years later, Theodore renewed the former extensive trade privileges to the Venetians operating in the empire of Nicaea.¹⁰¹

The peaceful relations with the Latins left Theodore free to tackle the empire of Trebizond which owed allegiance to the Latin emperor of Constantinople. In that year Theodore annexed all their lands west of Sinope (Sinop), including Herakleia (Ereğli) and Amastris (Amasra).¹⁰² This provoked the Seljuk ruler, Keykavus I (1210–20). He attacked Trebizond (Trabzon), seized Sinope (1215–16), captured Alexios Komnenos and reinstalled him on the throne of Trebizond as his vassal. With Sinope as their naval base, the Seljuks were gradually to develop into an important maritime element in the Black Sea.¹⁰³

97 Manuel Mavrozomes (Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 626, 638; Magoulias, pp. 343, 350).

98 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 9, p. 15 (Macrides, p. 129); cf. Choniates, *Historia*, p. 640 (Magoulias, p. 351), who states that the Turks failed to capture the city.

99 E. Gerland, *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel, I: Geschichte der Kaiser Baldwin I und Heinrich 1204–16* (Homburg v.d. Höhe, 1905), pp. 210 ff.

100 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 15, pp. 27–8 (Macrides, pp. 148–9).

101 August 1219, Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, no. 252, pp. 205–7; D. Jacoby, 'The Economy of Latin Constantinople, 1204–61', in *Urbs Capta: the Fourth Crusade and its Consequences/La IVe croisade et ses conséquences*, ed. A. E. Laiou (Paris, 2005), pp. 206–7.

102 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 11, p. 18 (Macrides, p. 132); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, p. 306 n. 6.

103 Ahrweiler, *Mer*, p. 307 n. 4.

During this period Epirus under Michael I Angelos (1204–15) grew in importance, but it was under his half-brother and successor, Theodore Angelos (1215–24), that conflict broke out between the two Byzantine states.¹⁰⁴ By then, Theodore Angelos had captured Peter of Courtenay, the newly elect emperor of Constantinople, Henry's successor, on his way to Constantinople, and had turned his attention to the kingdom of Thessalonike, which, since the death of Boniface of Monferrat in his campaign against the Bulgars in 1207, had lost its vitality and direction. In addition, the return of the crusaders to the west and the lack of support since Henry's death in 1216 had undermined the Latin empire's ability to survive. Towards the end of 1224, after a long-drawn-out siege, the city capitulated.¹⁰⁵ Theodore Angelos now controlled an extensive part of the territory of the old empire, which gave him the justification to style himself 'Emperor of the Romans', and assume the three imperial family names of Angelos, Doukas and Komnenos, thus challenging the Nicaean pre-eminence.

In Nicaea, Theodore I Laskaris bequeathed the crown to his son-in-law John III Doukas Vatatzes (1222–54). This unleashed a rebellion by Theodore's brothers supported by the Latins, who also in 1228 sought an alliance with the Seljuks against Vatatzes. The attempt to overthrow him failed, and as a result of his victory by both land and sea the Latin lands in Asia Minor passed under Byzantine dominion, with the exception of the coast opposite Constantinople and the territory round Nicomedia (İzmit). Vatatzes was now able to strengthen and expand the fleet, originally organised by Theodore I, and to extend Byzantine control over the Aegean islands lying between Greece and Asia Minor. He harassed Latin shipping moving towards Constantinople, and along the coast of Thrace.¹⁰⁶ His naval capability inevitably could not compete at this stage with the Venetian fleet, whose primary aim though seems to have been the control of the sea routes that would promote their mercantile activities. By then the Venetians had established links with the Frankish Levant, and had concluded treaties with Keyhüsrev I, which gave them access to Attaleia (Antalya), indispensable for their commercial activities with Egypt. In addition, under his successor, Keykavus I, by then in control of Sinope (Sinop), they secured a further agreement and, of major importance, access to the Black Sea region under the agreement renewed with Keykubad I

104 For Epirus in general see D. M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epirus* (Oxford, 1957).

105 J. Longnon, 'La reprise de Salonique par les grecs en 1224', in *Actes du VI^e congrès international d'études byzantines* (Paris 27 juillet–2 août 1948), vol. I (Paris, 1950), pp. 141–6.

106 Choniates, *Historia*, p. 638 (Magoulias, p. 350); Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 22, p. 36 (Macrides, p. 166); Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 304–5, 311–16.

(1220–37) in 1220.¹⁰⁷ These commercial successes would eventually be extended as far as Crimea, and would involve other western merchants, including Pisans, Amalfitans and Genoese after the Veneto-Genoese treaty in 1232.

This mercantile prosperity could hardly stem the gradual political deterioration and fragmentation of Latin rule, which inevitably weakened their hold on the conquered lands.¹⁰⁸ The realization of this among the occupied Greeks is illustrated by the appeal made by the population of Adrianople (Edirne) to Vatatzes in 1225 to take possession of the city.¹⁰⁹ Nicaea's pre-eminence, however, was challenged by Theodore Angelos who by now ruled not only the kingdom of Thessalonike but also parts of Thrace and had entered into an alliance with Ivan Asen II of Bulgaria (1218–41) against Vatatzes. Theodore moved against Adrianople, forcing Vatatzes to withdraw. His success spurred him on to focus his attention on Constantinople. In this, he was stopped by his ally, Ivan Asen, whose aspirations to create a Bulgaro-Byzantine empire with its capital in Constantinople went counter to Theodore's plans. Theodore dissolved the agreements and turned against his former ally, but, defeated in 1230, he was taken prisoner.¹¹⁰ His domains in Epirus, Thessaly and Thessalonike passed to his brother Manuel, though his recent acquisitions in Thrace, Macedonia and part of Albania were incorporated into Asen's kingdom. Asen, in addition, supplanted Greek influence in Serbia. The capture of Constantinople, however, eluded Asen despite the various and ever-changing alliances and diplomatic manoeuvrings. After his death in 1241, and the Mongol invasion in 1243, which affected both the Balkans and the Turkish emirates in Asia Minor, Bulgaria was out of the contest for the capture of Constantinople, thus leaving Nicaea as the sole contender.

The friendly relations and commercial exchanges established between Nicaea and the Seljuks during the Mongol invasion were of short duration. In 1243 the Mongols defeated the Seljuks, whose control was fractured, resulting in the emergence of various beyliks including those of Aydın and Menteşe on the western coast of Anatolia.¹¹¹ Hostilities resumed once the Mongol threat had receded. From 1250 onwards, Vatatzes undertook a number of expeditions

107 Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, pp. 221–5; C. Cahen, 'Le commerce anatolien au début du XIII^e siècle', in *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halpen* (Paris, 1953), pp. 93–4, rep. in Cahen, *Turcobyzantina et Oriens Christianus* (London, 1974), XII; Jacoby, 'The Economy of Latin Constantinople', pp. 204–5.

108 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 22, pp. 34–5 (Macrides, pp. 165–6).

109 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 24, p. 38 (Macrides, pp. 171–2).

110 Akropolites, *Opera*, I, § 24–5, pp. 38–43 (Macrides, pp. 172–3, 178–9).

111 On the two emirates see Lemerle, *L'émirat*, pp. 10 ff. On their relations with the Venetians see E. A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteşe and Aydın (1300–1415)* (Venice, 1983).

to hold back Turkoman and Seljuk encroachment along the frontier.¹¹² This situation continued under his successors. A partial remedy, following the long-established Byzantine tradition, was to settle the troublesome and destructive Cumans along the frontier regions in the Meander valley as well as in Macedonia and Thrace in order to strengthen the defences, and gradually assimilate them into a sedentary way of life.¹¹³ During his long reign Vatatzes succeeded in doubling the size of the empire of Nicaea. He had laid strong economic and social foundations¹¹⁴ and against all odds he had emerged from all the competing forces as the statesman poised to capture the city and restore the Byzantine Empire. This did not, in fact, take place under him or his son, Theodore II Laskaris (1254–8), or his grandson John IV Laskaris (1258–9), but under the usurper Michael VIII Palaeologos (1259–82), who went on to establish his own dynasty by eliminating the Laskarids.¹¹⁵

A resourceful statesman, Michael was able to defeat the triple anti-Nicaean coalition, formed by Frederick II's son Manfred of Sicily, Michael of Epirus and William of Villehardouin of Achaia, at the battle of Pelagonia (1259).¹¹⁶ As a result of this resounding defeat, their newly found ally, the Serbian king, Uroš, had to withdraw from the recently occupied Macedonian cities. The way was now open for the capture of the city. To neutralise any possible resistance by the Venetians, Michael negotiated with the Genoese rivals, and signed a treaty at Nymphaeum (Nymphaion) in March 1261. In accordance with this treaty, in return for extensive commercial privileges enjoyed in the past by the Venetians, the Genoese were to provide naval aid to the empire.¹¹⁷ As it turned out, this proved unnecessary. Constantinople was captured by Michael's commander, Alexios Strategopoulos, who, while reconnoitring in its vicinity, found the city defenceless with the greater part of the Frankish garrison having sailed with the Venetian fleet into the Black Sea against the island of Daphnousion.¹¹⁸

112 For the Turkomans see Akropolites, *Opera*, i, § 65, p. 136 (Macrides, p. 315).

113 George Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, vol. I, ed. A. Failler and V. Laurent (Paris, 1984), iv, p. 28; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1829–55), i, p. 37; Akropolites, *Opera*, i, § 40, p. 65 (Macrides, p. 215).

114 Gregoras, *Historia*, i, pp. 41–4.

115 On Michael VIII Palaeologos, see D. Geanakopoulou, *Emperor Michael Palaeologos and the West, 1258–1282* (Cambridge, 1959).

116 For details see D. J. Geanakopoulou, 'Greco-Latin Relations on the Eve of the Byzantine Restoration: the Battle of Pelagonia', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953), 99–141.

117 C. Manfroni, 'Le relazioni fra Genova, l'impero bizantino ed i Turchi', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 28 (1898), 791–809. For subsequent Genoese commercial activities see K. Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1999).

118 Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, i, ii, pp. 192 ff.

The last phase, 1261–1453

For Michael Palaeologos, the capture of Constantinople was the first step towards the restoration of the rest of the empire. This inevitably brought him into conflict with the Bulgars and the Mongols over Thrace and Macedonia, the Despotate of Epirus with its claims on Thessaly, the Latins in the Peloponnese and the Aegean islands. With the capture of Constantinople, the empire's position was transformed from a provincial state into a power with an important role in Mediterranean politics, and hence needing to neutralise its enemies in the west through diplomatic means, for the restoration of its former lands could not be achieved militarily given its financial situation. The main obstacle to Michael's plans of restoration was the Sicilian kingdom, which assumed the role of protector of the Latins in Greece, first under Manfred of Hohenstaufen (1258–66) and later under Charles of Anjou (1265–85), the brother of the king of France. In order to counteract Manfred's plans Michael entered into negotiations with the papacy. Though Urban IV (1261–4) had at first given his support to the Franks in the Peloponnese and had excommunicated the Genoese for their co-operation with Michael, his objection to the house of the Hohenstaufen prevented him from forming an alliance between Sicily and the papacy. In fact, the pope later actively supported Charles of Anjou in taking over the kingdom of Sicily. Taking advantage of this situation Michael VIII approached the papacy with the offer of the union of the two churches, those of Rome and Constantinople. The time was important, for though Michael had earlier been successful in the Peloponnese, the situation had now been reversed and the empire had to fight on three fronts. As his allies the Genoese had been defeated by the Venetians in the Gulf of Nauplia in the spring of 1263, Michael was forced to end his alliance with Genoa and begin negotiations with Venice in 1265 with the aim of renewing and extending the privileges they had once enjoyed under the Komnenoi. But, as the Venetians were slow to ratify the treaty,¹¹⁹ Michael renewed his agreements in 1267 with the Genoese, who by then had established their dominance in the Black Sea. In addition he granted them quarters in Galata, a suburb in Constantinople, which was to develop into an important commercial base.¹²⁰ Michael was clearly aware that

119 The treaty was in fact ratified in 1268: Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata*, III, pp. 76 ff.; Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, pp. 66–77.

120 Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, II, v, pp. 535–7. For the expansion of the Genoese see S. Pascu (ed.), *Genovezzi la Marea Neagră în secolele XIII–XIV. I Genovesi ner Mar Nero durante i secoli XIII e XIV* (Bucharest, 1977); Balard, *Romanie génoise*, I, pp. 50 ff.

without a navy to give him mastery of the seas it was impossible to defend the city.¹²¹

The victory of Charles of Anjou at the battle of Benevento in 1266 renewed Latin aspirations for the recapture of Constantinople and a pact was signed a year later on 27 May 1267 with the ousted Latin emperor, Baldwin II, in the presence of the pope. Shortly thereafter Charles intervened in Greece and took over Manfred's possessions in Epirus with the support of William II Villehardouin, who placed himself under his protection. Charles widened his circle of allies against Byzantium by entering into alliance with both Serbs and Bulgars. To counteract this pressure, Michael VIII reopened negotiations with Pope Clement IV on the question of the unification of the two churches. On Clement's death in 1268 he turned to the king of France, Louis IX, Charles's brother, whose ambition was to liberate the Holy Land rather than to recapture Constantinople. Charles's participation in his brother's crusade against Tunisia lifted the immediate western pressure off Byzantium. In order to counteract hostilities from Serbs, Bulgarians and the Seljuks, Michael entered into a series of agreements with the Hungarians, the Tatars of the Golden Horde and the Mamluks of Egypt. In addition, negotiations with Rome, resumed after Gregory X's installation in 1271 in the hope that the papacy would put a check on Charles of Anjou's ambitions against Byzantium, led Michael to conclude the union of the two churches at the Council of Lyons on 6 July 1274, despite strong opposition from the majority of the Byzantine clergy and people.¹²² This union, however, was not to last.

The new political situation gave Michael the opportunity to resume his activities aimed at the reconquest of the territories in Greece. Though he failed in Thessaly he succeeded in parts of the Peloponnese and in Arcadia, and with the help of the Italian Licario he captured Euboea and a number of the Aegean islands, excluding Naxos and Andros, thus establishing a naval presence in the area and clearing the archipelago of piracy.¹²³ The fall of the Angevins in Sicily, instigated by Michael in 1282, put an end to their hopes of recapturing Constantinople.¹²⁴ On the other hand, his western political

121 Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, II, iv, pp. 400–3; cf. Gregoras, *Historia*, I, p. 416.

122 J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 220–42, citing sources.

123 Michael VIII Palaeologus, *De vita sua*, ed. H. Grégoire, 'Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi *De vita sua*', *Byzantion* 29–30 (1959–60), 456–9; Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 357, 368–9. A number of these islands were later to pass under Venetian rule. See P. Charanis, 'Piracy in the Aegean during the Reign of Michael VIII Palaeologus', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10 (1950), 127–36.

124 Michael Palaeologus, *De vita sua*, p. 461. On the whole incident see S. Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge, 1958).

orientation, perhaps imposed on him by the circumstances of the time, as it had been on Manuel I, led to the neglect of the Asiatic lands, which had remained faithful to the Laskarids. In the early stages of Michael's assuming power the population of Bithynia, in collaboration with the army, rebelled against him.¹²⁵ Opposition to his rule spread also in the aftermath of the ecclesiastical union with Rome. As a result of heavy taxation, depletion of agricultural manpower (recruited to fight in his western campaigns), the dissatisfaction of the population and the upheavals brought about by the enemy attacks, what remained of Byzantine Asia Minor thirty years after the reconquest of Constantinople were some isolated fortresses, which controlled the coast from the Black Sea along the Aegean to the Mediterranean, the rest having fallen to the Turkomans. At the same time, what was to prove a more formidable enemy, the Ottoman Turks, settled in the region of Sangarios (Sakarya) and made their appearance on the coast of Bithynia.¹²⁶ The disintegration of life, the wanton destruction of the towns by the enemy both in the Balkans and in the east, the sale of the inhabitants into slavery, famine and plague, and the stream of refugees to Constantinople, exacerbated the situation. This was the legacy that Michael VIII left to his son Andronikos at his death in 1282, a situation which worsened with the passage of time.¹²⁷

Under strong economic pressure Andronikos II (1282–1328) followed a policy of conciliation towards the west, the Serbs and the Bulgars through a series of marriage alliances that succeeded in stemming their advance for a time.¹²⁸ Unwittingly he sided with Genoa against Venice in the conflict that broke out between the two maritime powers in 1296. Abandoned by the Genoese, who concluded peace with the Venetians three years later, Byzantium had ultimately to give in to Venetian demands for compensation and on 4 October 1302 renewed the commercial privileges granted to them in 1277.¹²⁹ Faced with these financial burdens and the ever-deteriorating economic conditions, loss of revenue from tax exemptions and abuse of office, Andronikos resorted to reducing both the army and navy and was forced to rely entirely on foreign mercenaries¹³⁰ in order to stem the Turkish advance. He first negotiated with

125 Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, I, iii, pp. 259–71.

126 Pachymeris, *Relations historiques*, I, iii, pp. 292–3; II, iv, pp. 402–5; Gregoras, *Historia*, I, pp. 137–42; II, pp. 214–5; Lemerle, *L'émirat*, pp. 11 ff.; P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1958), pp. 32 ff.; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 250–3; Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 335, 372.

127 Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, IV, x, pp. 322–3; xi, pp. 422–5, 474–9, 484–5; Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp. 160–3.

128 See in general A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: the Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).

129 *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, ed. G. M. Thomas, vol. I (Venice, 1880), pp. 12–16.

130 Gregoras, *Historia*, II, pp. 174–6, 223.

the Alans, allowing them to settle in the empire as soldiers, but, defeated by the Turks in their first encounter, they began to pillage Byzantine lands. Later, the highly experienced Catalan Grand Company of mercenaries, under Roger de Flor, at the time out of employment, offered their services to the emperor, who accepted their terms and in addition showered Roger with titles in order to incorporate him within the Byzantine administrative structure. In 1304 in their first encounter with the Turks, who were then besieging Philadelphia (Alaşehir), the Catalans were successful, thus proving once again what a small but well-trained and cohesive army could achieve. But relying on an alien independent mercenary army, dissatisfied with irregular pay, proved a risky solution. Soon thereafter the Catalans began attacking and pillaging the Byzantine countryside. Persuaded to move to the European section during the winter of that year, they returned in the spring to continue pillaging and transporting Turks from Asia to Thrace, despite the presence of the Byzantine navy.¹³¹ Far from ameliorating the situation, the assassination of Roger de Flor (1305) in fact worsened it.¹³² To avenge their leader's death the Catalans moved into Thrace and in conjunction with Alans and Turks continued their plunder, resulting in famine in the capital during the winter of 1306/7.¹³³ They later headed to Thessaly, defeated the Franks, and took over Thebes and Athens, thus establishing a Catalan principality.¹³⁴

During these turbulent events, the Byzantines, as a result of their victory at Pelagonia in 1259, had succeeded in securing the fortresses of Monembasia, Mane, Geraki and Mystras,¹³⁵ and despite periodic defeats went on gradually to consolidate and expand their possessions, ultimately developing into a quasi-independent state which will later be referred to as the Despotate of the Morea. Given the distance of these possessions from Constantinople and the precarious nature of communications by sea as a result of piracy, governors in charge

¹³¹ Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, iv, xiii, pp. 668–9.

¹³² Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 136–47.

¹³³ Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, iv, xiii, pp. 690–1; A. Laiou, 'The Provisioning of Constantinople during the Winter of 1306–1307', *Byzantion* 37 (1967), 91–113.

¹³⁴ A. Rubio I. Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient Català* (Barcelona, 1947, repr. 2001); R. J. Loenertz, 'Athènes et Néopatras, registes et notices pour servir à l'histoire des duchés catalans (1311–1394)', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 25 (1955), 100–212, 428–431; 28 (1958), 5–91, re-edited in Loenertz and P. Schreiner (eds.), *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca articles parus de 1935 à 1966*, vol. I (Rome, 1970), pp. 183–393; E. A. Zachariadou, 'The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of the Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area', *Studi Medievali*, 3rd ser., 21 (1980), 621–38. On the Catalans in Greece in general see K. M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens 1311–88* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948).

¹³⁵ Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, i, i, pp. 122–3; D. A. Zakynthinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée. Histoire politique*, rev. edn Ch. Maltezou, 2 vols. (London, 1975), i, pp. 17–20. For the principality of Achaia, see also Bon, *La Morée franque*.

of these areas, although originally appointed annually under Andronikos II, were later given extended tenure. Owing to the circumstances, which required speed and continuity of decision making, they were on occasion to act without consulting Constantinople, though not to act in a manner contrary to imperial policy.¹³⁶

In the Balkans, the Bulgars, taking advantage of this turbulent situation, extended their dominion along the coast of the Black Sea, capturing fortresses and seaports, among them Mesembria and Anchialos, victories confirmed by the Byzantino-Bulgarian treaty of 1307.¹³⁷ In the west, Philip of Tarentum seized Dyrrachium, while Charles of Valois, aspiring to the crown of Constantinople, entered into an agreement with Venice, Charles II of Anjou, king of Naples, and Pope Clement V.¹³⁸ This alliance was further strengthened by Charles of Valois allying himself with the king of Serbia, and with members of the Byzantine nobility. As a result of this expedition, Theobald of Cepoy, Charles of Valois's representative, received an oath of fealty from the Catalan Company. But it was Venice that derived real profit from this expedition. Its fleet had cleared the Aegean of piracy, while its subjects, the Cornaro of Crete, had captured Karpathos.¹³⁹

Hardly were these difficulties out of the way than the empire was plunged into a civil war between Andronikos II and his grandson Andronikos III (1328–41). For a brief period a *modus vivendi* was established, which was to be disturbed by the death of Andronikos III, and the fresh conflict that broke out between the regency, headed by Anna of Savoy in the name of her young son, John V (1341–91), and John Kantakouzenos, Grand Domestic, who put himself forward as a rival emperor. To cover part of the costs of these military preparations the empress was forced to raise a loan of 30,000 ducats, placing part of the crown jewels as surety.¹⁴⁰ In the ensuing clash and ever-changing alliances, the Serbian ruler Dušan first sided with Kantakouzenos, but, alarmed at his successes in Thessaly, he swiftly jettisoned him and entered into an agreement with the regency in Constantinople. To counteract this new threat, Kantakouzenos turned to his old ally Umur, the emir of Aydın, and with his help was able

¹³⁶ In 1290 Florent de Hainault, prince of Achaia, refused to have the treaty confirmed by the governor, for he had reservations over the worth of a treaty signed by an official who exercised authority on an annual basis only: J. Smitt (ed.), *The Chronicle of the Morea* (London, 1904, repr. 1976), lines 8691–4, 2708–14, 8731–75.

¹³⁷ Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, iv, xiii, pp. 688–91; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 2303.

¹³⁸ *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levanticum*, i, pp. 48–53. ¹³⁹ See Thiriet, *Romanie*, p. 158 n. 2.

¹⁴⁰ On this see T. Bertelé, 'I gioielli della corona bizantina dati in pegno alla Repubblica Veneta nel sec. XIV e Mastino II della Scala', in *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*, vol. II (Milan, 1962), pp. 89–177.

to change the course of the civil war in his favour. At the beginning of 1343 Kantakouzenos moved into Thrace, extensively devastated by the pillaging of his allies.¹⁴¹ Meanwhile, the political conflict led to a social convulsion in Thessalonike with the Zealot revolt, which established the city's independence from Constantinople from 1342 to 1349.¹⁴²

Meanwhile, the western confederacy under the auspices of Pope Clement VI, formed in response to Anna of Savoy's appeals to the west against Kantakouzenos, which also entailed the prospects once again of the union of the two churches, included Venice, Cyprus, Naples, Genoa and the Hospitallers. The aim of the expedition was not to become involved in the Byzantine civil war but to stem the growing power of Aydın and its piratical activities in the Aegean.¹⁴³ In 1344 the crusading force partially occupied Smyrna (İzmir) with the result that the war with Umur dragged on for years. Unable to secure his support, Kantakouzenos, after consultation with Umur, approached in 1346 a more formidable ally, the Ottoman Sultan Orhan (c.1324–62) to whom he gave his daughter Theodora in marriage.¹⁴⁴ As a result of this help, he established his authority over the whole of Thrace, and went on to crown himself emperor with the aim of securing Constantinople. To counteract his progress, Empress Anna negotiated with the leader of Saruhan (a beylik on the Aegean coast in western Anatolia). The agreement misfired, for, instead of attacking Kantakouzenos, their force of 6,000 men invaded Bulgaria and plundered and devastated Thrace including the vicinity of Constantinople. The empress had soon to give up the struggle and recognise her opponent as Emperor John VI (1347–54). Her son John V married Kantakouzenos's younger daughter, Helena, thus legitimising his father-in-law's position. The conclusion of the civil war also put an end to the Zealot rebellion and Thessalonike returned to central government control. Yet, the economic state of the empire was in tatters. Thrace, the most fertile area left still in its possession, following social upheavals and Turkish devastation had turned into a desert.¹⁴⁵

141 John VI Kantakouzenos, *Ioannis Cantakuzeni ex imperatoris historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1828–32), II, pp. 344–8, 391–405; Gregoras, *Historia*, II, pp. 692–3; Lemerle, *L'émirat*, pp. 144 ff.

142 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, II, 570, lines 19–24; Gregoras, *Historia*, II, p. 796; V. Hrochová, 'La révolte des Zélotes à Salonique et les communes italiennes', *Byzantinoslavica* 22 (1961), 11–13; P. Charanis, 'Internal Strife in Byzantium during the Fourteenth Century', *Byzantion* 15 (1940–1), 208–30.

143 Letter of Pope Clement VI, ed. M. C. Faure, in Faure, 'Le Dauphin Humbert II à Venise et en Orient, 1345–1347', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome* 27 (1907), 543–5; Lemerle, *L'émirat*, pp. 180–203.

144 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum* II, pp. 585–9; I. Mélikoff-Sayar, *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha (Düsturname-i Enveri): text, translation et notes* (Paris, 1954), pp. 106 ff.

145 Gregoras, *Historia*, II, p. 683; Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, II, pp. 302 ff.

The power that profited most from the Byzantine civil war was Serbia. Under Stefan Dušan (1331–55), the Serbs had extended their dominion to Epirus and Macedonia, with the result that their possessions now stretched from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, and from the Adriatic to the Aegean coast. Constantinople itself, however, eluded them for they possessed no fleet and all attempts to involve Venice in their plans failed. On the contrary both maritime powers tried to derive some profit from the civil war and in 1346 the Genoese recaptured the island of Chios, which was to remain an important trading base until the mid-sixteenth century.¹⁴⁶ Equally important at sea were the Byzantines whose fleet, built under Andronikos III in reaction to the Turkish activities, was allowed to decline, despite its successes.¹⁴⁷ Faced with the aggressive attitude of the Genoese and anxious to assert the empire's commercial activities, Kantakouzenos set out to construct a navy in 1347–8 despite the difficulties in recruiting experienced crews.¹⁴⁸ The immediate Genoese response was to set the arsenal of Constantinople on fire and to lay siege to the city in order to pursue their attacks on the maritime towns on the Pontus and the Propontis.¹⁴⁹ 'This attack put an end', as Gregoras admits, 'to the empire's hopes of deriving any profit from the commercial activity of Constantinople.'¹⁵⁰ This event, in addition to the extensive privileges granted to both Venice and Genoa, which controlled almost all aspects of Byzantine commercial life, made any recovery impossible.¹⁵¹ Though active, it was to remain limited and subordinate to the extensive Latin activities.¹⁵²

In these pressing circumstances the Veneto-Genoese antagonism came as a relief to the Byzantines, forcing the Genoese to direct their activities against their rivals who aimed at breaking their monopoly of the Black Sea trade. In the ensuing confrontation, Venice allied with Peter IV of Aragon, joined at a later stage by Kantakouzenos. The naval confrontation in 1352 was indecisive and the

146 Ph. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the Island, 1346–1566*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1958): terms of capitulation of the island, vol. II, pp. 26–32.

147 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, I, pp. 370 ff.; Gregoras, *Historia*, I, pp. 523 ff.; Ahrweiler, *Mer*, pp. 383–8.

148 Gregoras, *Historia*, II, pp. 857–8.

149 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, pp. 68 ff., 82; Alexios Macrembolites, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας*, vol. I, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (St Petersburg, 1891), pp. 146–53.

150 Gregoras, *Historia*, II, p. 841.

151 J. Chrysostomides, 'Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 267–356; Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 260–77; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, I, pp. 78–81.

152 N. Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe–XVe siècles)* (Montreal, 1979).

war dragged on until 1355, when peace was signed. Meanwhile, Kantakouzenos, left to rely on his own resources, was forced to make peace with the Genoese and recognise their demands, particularly as they had by now entered into an agreement with Orhan. In response to this move the Venetians came to an understanding with John V who, relegated to a minor position by his father-in-law, took the opportunity to rebel against him in November 1354. The Venetians offered John V a loan of 20,000 ducats on the understanding that he would hand over the island of Tenedos as collateral.¹⁵³ This agreement did not materialise. Nevertheless John V opened hostilities against his brother-in-law Matthew Kantakouzenos, then governor of Adrianople (Edirne) and the surrounding area. The city opened its gates and welcomed in the legitimate emperor, while Matthew retired to the citadel. He was rescued by his father who arrived with his Turkish troops to recover the lost areas and punish the culprits by unleashing his soldiers to plunder ferociously.¹⁵⁴ To salvage the situation John V appealed to the Bulgars and Serbs, receiving from Stefan Dušan a cavalry division of 4,000 men, while Orhan provided Kantakouzenos with a contingent under his son, Süleyman.¹⁵⁵ The defeat of John V's forces led Kantakouzenos to the decision to set aside the legitimate emperor and declare his own son Matthew co-emperor. But his triumph was short lived. Turkish assistance had its complications. Not only did it alienate the majority of the population, who now sided with the legitimate emperor, but the Ottomans themselves were far from being satisfied with providing soldiery, or looting and plundering the countryside. They were now seeking to establish themselves in the European section of what was left of the empire. In 1352 they took possession of Tzympe near Callipolis (Gallipoli, Gelibolu), and two years later in March 1354 Orhan's son, Süleyman, occupied Callipolis despite Kantakouzenos's pleas for its return.¹⁵⁶

John V soon seized the ascendancy and, with the help of the Genoese, he was able to recover his throne, forcing his father-in-law to abdicate and enter a monastery. But their relations seem to have remained amicable. Kantakouzenos spent the rest of his days in writing up his history and in taking part in theological discussions and political decisions. His son Manuel Kantakouzenos continued to rule the Byzantine Peloponnese successfully, and at his

153 *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, I, pp. 17 ff.; Bertelé, 'Gioielli', pp. 112–13.

154 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, pp. 242 ff.

155 Gregoras, *Historia*, III, p. 181; Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, pp. 246–8, who gives the size of the contingent as 7,000.

156 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, pp. 277–8; P. Schreiner (ed.), *Chronica Byzantina Breviora. Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1975–9), I, 7 § 13, p. 66; II, p. 283.

death he was succeeded for a brief period by his brother Matthew. In 1382 the governance passed to John V's youngest son, Theodore I Palaeologos.¹⁵⁷

With Süleyman's occupation of Callipolis (Gelibolu) a systematic Turkish advance began in Thrace. The capture of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka) in 1361, and subsequently that of Adrianople (Edirne),¹⁵⁸ ushered in the methodical occupation of the Balkans, consolidated under Murad I (1362–89) by an effective policy of colonisation.¹⁵⁹ Faced with the Turkish advance Bulgaria was forced to submit, resulting in a confrontation with both Hungary and Byzantium, in the course of which the Byzantines occupied Anchialos on the coast of the Black Sea. This, however, was a small consolation. John V's appeal to Rome had no response. He turned to Hungary, journeying to Buda in 1366, but there too disappointment awaited him. Louis I of Hungary, like the papacy, demanded conversion to the Catholic faith prior to military help. On his way home John V was detained by the Bulgarians, and it was only through the assistance of his cousin Amadeo of Savoy, the Green Count, who had arrived with a small crusading army, that he was liberated. Amadeo seized Callipolis (Gelibolu), and attacked the Bulgarians, forcing them to free the emperor and return both Mesembria and Sozopolis on the Black Sea to the Byzantines.

But in order to confront the Ottomans a greater force was needed which could only come from the west, for since the death of Stefan Dušan and the fragmentation of the Serbs no power was left in the Balkans to face the Turks. It was imperative, therefore, to secure western help. This meant appealing to Rome, as Michael VIII had done in the past, and indeed as John V had done in 1355, with the offer of union of the two churches.¹⁶⁰ On this occasion Amadeo persuaded the emperor to travel to Rome to make his confession of faith in the hope that this would lead to military assistance. The majority of the clergy and the people seem to have been against the idea, and despite Kantakouzenos's insistence that any attempt at the union of the two churches had to be conducted through an ecumenical council, John V left for Rome, where he made his personal confession of faith in 1369.¹⁶¹ In so far as military assistance to Byzantium was concerned it was an utter failure. On his way back

157 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore*, ed. J. Chrysostomides (Thessalonike, 1985), pp. 114–15.

158 Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, I, § 14, p. 60; II, p. 289.

159 F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.–15. Jahrhundert)* (Brno, Munich and Vienna, 1944), pp. 45 ff.

160 For analysis of the letter John V sent to the pope see O. Halecki, *Un empereur à Rome* (Warsaw, 1930), pp. 31 ff.

161 J. Meyendorff, 'Projet de Concile Oecuménique en 1367; un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14 (1960), 147–77; Halecki, *Un empereur*, pp. 189 ff.

John V, weighed down by debts, offered the sale of Tenedos to the Venetians.¹⁶² Owing to its geographical position at the entrance of the Hellespont, Tenedos controlled the shipping to the Black Sea. Described by the Venetians as 'la chiave dello stretto', the key to the straits, it was in consequence much prized by them.¹⁶³ The deal, however, was postponed, but given Genoese commercial interests in the region, and particularly in Caffa, the island was to become a bone of contention between the Venetians and the Genoese a few years later.

The external political pressures brought to bear by the Ottoman advance into the Balkans and the defeat of the Serbs at the battle of Çirmen on the Maritsa (Meriç) river in 1371 were further increased by the dynastic conflicts which were to shake the empire once more for the following two decades. In 1373 John V's eldest son and co-emperor, Andronikos IV, and Savcı, Murad's son, revolted against their respective fathers. They were both captured, but Andronikos survived his punishment and was imprisoned. His place in the succession was taken by his brother, Manuel II, who reigned as co-emperor until 1376. In that year Andronikos staged his second revolt, instigated by the Genoese to prevent the cession of Tenedos to the Venetians agreed by John V in return for the crown jewels and the establishment of a joint Veneto-Byzantine rule on the island.¹⁶⁴ Before the Genoese had time to occupy the island the Venetians had annexed it, thus unleashing the Chioggia War between the two maritime cities which was to last until the treaty of Turin in August 1381. The treaty stipulated the demilitarisation and evacuation of the island, and that the inhabitants be dispersed to the Venetian colonies. Despite repeated pleas by the Byzantines Tenedos was never returned to them but Venice continued to use it as a commercial base.¹⁶⁵

Having overthrown his father and brother with Turkish help, Andronikos ruled until 1379. In that summer John V and Manuel II, with Turkish and

162 J. Chrysostomides, 'John V Palaeologus in Venice (1370–1371) and the Chronicle of Caroldo: a Reinterpretation', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31 (1965), 76–84. The disappointment over the entire venture to the west was described by Demetrios Kydonēs in a letter to his friend Constantine Asanes as ἀνθρακες: Kydonēs, *Démétrius Cydonēs Correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, vol. I (Vatican City, 1956), no. 71, p. 103, line 16.

163 According to Daniele di Chinazzo, Tenedos 'si è la chiave della bocha a tutti quelli del mondo che voia navegar in lo Mar Maçor, çoè ala Tana, in Trabexonda et assa' altre parte': *Cronica de la guerra da Veneciani a Zenovesi*, ed. V. Lazzarini, *Monumenti storici deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie*, n.s., 11 (Venice, 1958), p. 18.

164 J. Chrysostomides, 'Studies on the Chronicle of Caroldo with Special Reference to the History of Byzantium from 1370 to 1377', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), 153.

165 F. Thiriet, 'Venise et l'occupation de Ténédos au XIV^e siècle', *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome* 65 (1953), 241–5.

Venetian assistance, recaptured the city.¹⁶⁶ In the arrangement concluded in 1381–2 Andronikos IV was recognised as the legitimate heir and Manuel, apparently against his father's wishes, moved to Thessalonike where he had earlier been governor. There he attempted to pursue an independent course of action and, in opposition to his father's policy of appeasement towards the Ottomans, opened hostilities against them. At first successful, Manuel was to lose the city to the Turks after a four-year siege in 1387 and was forced to submit to Murad I.¹⁶⁷ After Andronikos's third rebellion and subsequent death, Manuel was faced with a fresh dynastic rebellion by John VII, Andronikos's son, who had been excluded from his inheritance as a result of his father's final revolt. With the assistance of the Turks and the Genoese, John VII seized Constantinople in 1390, but had to flee when Manuel regained the city with the help of the Hospitallers.¹⁶⁸ On his father's death in 1391 Manuel succeeded to the throne.

These early years were undoubtedly the most humiliating period of Manuel's life, as his letters and *Dialogues* indicate. As a vassal of the Turks he had earlier had to participate with his father in the campaigns of Murad against other Turkish beyliks, but most unbearable were the two campaigns conducted by Bayezid I (1389–1402) in Asia Minor in 1390 and 1391, one of which was against the Byzantine city of Philadelphia (Alaşehir).¹⁶⁹ Manuel was forced to witness atrocities and suffer hardships and indignities. But what he found intolerable was, as he wrote, the thought that he 'had to fight along with those and on behalf of those whose every increase in strength lessens our own strength'.¹⁷⁰

The more prosperous part of what was left of the empire at the time was the Byzantine Peloponnese. Despite the vicissitudes of the civil war between John V and John VI Kantakouzenos, and periodic clashes with the principality of Achaia, the province under Manuel Kantakouzenos prospered. In co-operation with the principality of Achaia and the Venetians, Manuel was

166 Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, 1, 7 §§ 24–6, 31–2, pp. 95–6; 22 §§ 15–17, p. 182; 7 § 19, p. 67; Kydones, *Correspondence*, II, no. 167, pp. 38–9, no. 222, pp. 106–7, no. 224, p. 115; Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1843), pp. 43–6.

167 G. T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Paleologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387* (Rome, 1960).

168 Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, 1, 7 §§ 21–22, pp. 68–9; Manuel II Palaeologus, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 170–1.

169 E. A. Zachariadou, 'Manuel II on the Strife between Bayezid I and Kadi Burhan al-Din Ahmad', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), 471–81; Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1843), p. 64.

170 *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*, ed. G. T. Dennis (Washington, DC, 1977), 19, p. 57, lines 8–10, 16, p. 43, lines 7–14, 64–75; *Dialoge mit einem Perser*, ed. E. Trapp (Vienna, 1968), *Prooemium*, p. 5, lines 9–11, x, p. 120, line 23, p. 121, line 5, v, p. 50, lines 1–7.

able to stem the ravages of the Catalan–Turkish aggression.¹⁷¹ In 1376, an event occurred which was to prove momentous for the fortunes of the Peloponnese. In that year the princess of Achaia, Queen Joanna I of Naples (1341–82), anxious to protect her domains threatened by the Albanians and the Turks, entered into an agreement with the Hospitallers of Rhodes placing the principality under their protection for a period of five years. Sometime later, in mid-1378 the Hospitallers hired two companies of Navarrese and Gascon mercenaries for eight months.¹⁷² This assignment provided the Navarrese with the opportunity to settle in Greece where they were to become a major source of disruption for the Byzantine province.

After the expiration of their contract the Navarrese offered their services to Neri Acciaiuoli, the lord of Corinth, who, taking advantage of the internal conflict in the Catalan duchies, was able to secure Megara and soon after Thebes and Livadia.¹⁷³ Soon, however, the Navarrese went on the rampage, attacking the Acciaiuoli estates and vandalising the area.¹⁷⁴ These destructive activities, features of an undisciplined mercenary army, were soon to be transformed into a drive for the conquest of the principality of Achaia, which they achieved. The overthrow of Queen Joanna I by Charles III of Durazzo indirectly furthered their fortunes, for they immediately swore allegiance to the new prince of Achaia, Jacques de Baux, and their three leaders were recognised as *baillies* and captains of the principality.¹⁷⁵ Of the three leaders of the Navarrese Company of mercenaries, Pierre de Saint Superan was to emerge as vicar general of the principality of Achaia, whereupon he put into motion his plans for expansion into Byzantine territory. This coincided with the death of Manuel Kantakouzenos in April 1380, and the rebellion of the *archons* (individuals who wielded authority) against the central authority of the Palaeologoi.¹⁷⁶ Though Manuel's brother, Matthew, assumed authority he lacked his brother's ability to impose his will on the *archons*, whose centrifugal tendencies

171 Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, pp. 89–90; A. Morel-Fatio (ed.), *Libro de los fechos* (Geneva, 1885), §§ 684–5, pp. 150–1; J. A. C. Buchon, *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté de Morée*, vol. II (Paris, 1843), no. 25, pp. 145–6; Bon, *La Morée franque*, I, pp. 187 ff., 229.

172 R.-J. Loenertz, 'Hospitatiers et Navarrais en Grèce 1376–1383. Régestes et documents', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 22 (1956), 319–60; also in Loenertz and Schreiner, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, I, pp. 329–69.

173 Rubió I. Lluch, *Diplomatari*, nos. 354, 384, pp. 440, 465. Neri's role in the capture of Thebes is not clear, but he was later to buy the castellany from the Navarrese.

174 MP, nos. 18–20, pp. 40–44.

175 It was in this capacity that they signed a treaty of good neighbourliness with Venice in 1382: MP, no. 17, pp. 36–9.

176 Manuel II Palaeologus, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 115–17.

in the earlier stages of Manuel's rule had proved so destructive to the province.¹⁷⁷

It was to deal with this situation that Theodore I Palaeologos, John V's youngest son, was despatched to the Peloponnese to restore order. He was to rule the Despotate from 1382 to 1407. His first task was to establish a degree of co-operation with his neighbours, Venice and Neri Acciaiuoli. The more important of the two were the Venetians, for though their domains in the Peloponnese were limited to Coron and Modon, their influence was felt over the whole peninsula. Although the Navarrese had already signed treaties with both, their relations with Neri rested on shaky grounds, for their expansionist policies went counter to his ambitions to conquer the remaining Catalan duchies of Neopatras and Athens.

The first signs of a concerted policy between Neri and Theodore, who married the former's elder daughter, are seen in the attempts both made between 1383 and 1384 to draw Venice into an alliance to stem the Turkish piratical attacks.¹⁷⁸ These attempts failed and they had to rely on their own resources. The alliance was extended to include Theodore's brother Manuel II, then ruling Thessalonike and fighting a defensive war against the Turks.¹⁷⁹ However, despite a contingent of a hundred cavalry sent by Manuel II from Thessalonike and the small amount of military help given him by Neri, Theodore failed to subdue the rebels. Relying on Navarrese support, they turned down all his attempts at reconciliation.¹⁸⁰ In addition, the renewal of the Veneto-Navarrese treaty in 1387¹⁸¹ further weakened his position. This situation lasted until the capture of Thessalonike by the Turks in that year, and his brother's submission to Murad.

This disastrous event, together with the Turkish expansion into Serbia, Albania and central Greece, inevitably affected the rulers of both Thessaly and Epirus who were siphoned into the Ottoman sphere of influence.¹⁸² Theodore had no other alternative but to steer towards a rapprochement with the Turks, possibly through the mediation of his brother Manuel, when he presented himself in Prousa (Bursa) in the summer of 1387.¹⁸³ At any rate when Murad's

177 Zakythinos, *Le despotat*, pp. 99 ff.

178 MP, nos. 21–22, pp. 45–7, no. 29, p. 62, no. 27, p. 58.

179 MP, no. 27, p. 58; Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II*, pp. 77 ff.

180 MP, no. 27, p. 58. 181 MP, no. 37, p. 77.

182 F. Taeschner and P. Wittek, 'Die Vezirfamilie der Čandarlyzāde (14/15 Jhdt.) und ihre Denkmäler', *Der Islam* 18 (1929), 75; S. Cirac Estopañan (ed.), *Chronicle of Ionnina in Bizancio y España*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1943), I, pp. 159–60; II, p. 48; MP, no. 40, p. 89.

183 Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 46–7; R.-J. Loenertz, 'Manuel Paléologue, Épître à Cabasilas', *Μακεδονικά* 4 (1956), 35–7; Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II*, pp. 157–8.

commander Evrenos made his appearance in the Peloponnese in the early days of September of that year, he had come there as an ally at Theodore's invitation.¹⁸⁴ On his march to the south, Evrenos plundered parts of Thessaly and Albania, devastated areas of Achaia, and attacked and pillaged the territories of Coron and Modon.¹⁸⁵

A rapprochement with Murad offered also Neri Acciaiuoli important advantages. It put an end to the Turkish incursions against his possessions while Evrenos's armies dealt with his arch-enemies, the Navarrese. He was thus left free to press on with the conquest of the Catalan possessions and on 2 May 1388 he captured the Acropolis of Athens.¹⁸⁶ But the advantages Theodore reaped from the Turkish assistance, enabling him to break the opposition of his rebels, recover towns and fortresses from the Navarrese and consolidate his hold on the country, also had drawbacks. Evrenos's soldiery, who lived on pillage, spread destruction on their march through the Peloponnese, the Greek peasants bearing the full brunt of it. It soon became clear that the help given was a doubled-edged sword. In fact, the Turkish advance into the Morea had presented Evrenos with the opportunity of holding on to the captured territory and this new development left Theodore in a worse plight than before. In the summer of 1388 he visited Murad in Bursa. He was well received by the sultan and allowed to retain his lands,¹⁸⁷ becoming Murad's vassal, as his father and brother had before him. Emboldened by the sultan's support, Theodore even clashed with the Venetians over the cities of Argos and Nauplia, sold to them by Marie d'Enghien.¹⁸⁸

The Byzantine-Turkish co-operation came to an end with the death of Murad I at the battle of Kosovo Polje (Kosyphopedion) in 1389. The degree of freedom enjoyed by the Christian vassals in the reign of Murad I gave way to a rigid policy of centralisation under his successor, Bayezid I (1389–1402), who saw a vassal's function as serving purely Ottoman interests. He backed Andronikos IV's son John VII's attempt to oust his grandfather and assume

184 *Res Gestae Theodori Ioann. F. Palaeologi, Titulus metricus AD 1389*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 25 (1955), 209, lines 54–56; R.-J. Loenertz, 'Pour l'histoire du Péloponèse au XIV^e siècle (1382–1404)', *Études Byzantines* 1 (1943), 152–96, re-ed. in Loenertz and Schreiner, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 236 ff. For Evrenos, see I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Recherches sur les actes de règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I* (Munich, 1967), pp. 48, 233.

185 1387.1x.28, MP, no. 34, p. 79; 1387.x.3, no. 35, pp. 81–2. 186 MP, no. 41, p. 90.

187 *Res Gestae*, pp. 208–10, lines 47–78; Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, I, § 14, p. 244; Loenertz, 'Pour l'histoire du Péloponèse', pp. 229, 237.

188 R. Cessi, 'Venezia e l'acquisto di Nauplia ed Argo', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* n.s. 30 (1915), 147–73.

authority in Constantinople, though the attempt failed.¹⁸⁹ Soon afterwards there were rumours in Thessalonike and Constantinople that the sultan was building ships, and that he intended placing Manuel II in charge of this force which ostensibly was directed against Sinop, although the Venetians suspected that its true aim was their possessions of Negroponte (Euboea) and Crete.¹⁹⁰ Their fears were increased when, by 1393, Bayezid had annexed the beyliks of Aydın and Menteşe, subdued Karaman, subjugated Bulgaria and directed attacks against the Christian territories in the Aegean, Chios, Lesbos and Rhodes.¹⁹¹ Acquiring a foothold in the Peloponnese would not only have facilitated the eventual conquest of the province, but enabled him to launch a two-pronged attack on the Aegean islands. In the winter of 1393/4, after a meeting at Serres with his vassals, who included the Serbian princes and the Palaeologoi, Bayezid marched into central Greece, capturing the county of Salona (Amphissa), the last Catalan possession. On receiving the news of Timur's advance into Syria, he veered north and laid siege to Constantinople, a siege that was to last for six years.¹⁹² At the same time, another army, especially recruited in Thrace and well equipped, was dispatched to the Peloponnese with orders 'to spare nothing'.¹⁹³

During these desperate times, Manuel renewed his appeal to the west for help. He found a willing listener in King Sigismund, for with the conquest of Bulgaria, Hungary's independence was also threatened by the Ottomans. Sigismund's call for a crusade was answered by a number of European powers, particularly France. The venture ended in disaster at the battle of Nikopolis in 1396, Sigismund barely escaping with his life. The Turkish victory inevitably made the situation worse. In 1397 the Turks under Yakub Paşa invaded the peninsula, devastated the city of Argos and took its people into captivity.¹⁹⁴ The Venetian tragedy of Argos brought the realisation home to Theodore that in future he might not be able to defend his domains, although he had put up a valiant resistance at Leontarion on 21 June, forcing Yakub to beat a retreat.¹⁹⁵

189 Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, I, 7 §§ 21–22; Ignace of Smolensk, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople*, ed. G. P. Majeska (Washington, DC, 1984), pp. 100–4.

190 Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Misti 42, f. 55 (1392.iv.26); F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, vol. I (Paris, 1958), no. 813, p. 194.

191 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp. 76–8.

192 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, p. 157, lines 4–11; Loenertz, 'Pour l'histoire du Péloponèse', pp. 247–8; R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes* (Paris, 1948), pp. 512 ff.

193 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, p. 157, lines 14–19.

194 R.-J. Loenertz, 'La chronique brève moréote de 1423. Texte, traduction et commentaire', in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. II (Vatican, 1964), § 19, pp. 406, 424; Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, I, 33 § 19, p. 245; MP, nos. 197–198, pp. 392–5.

195 Loenertz, 'Chronique moréote', § 19, pp. 406, 424; Schreiner, *Chronica Byzantina Breviora*, I, 33 § 20, p. 245; II, p. 361.

Soon after that, the Turks besieged Corinth, leaving Theodore with no other option but to offer the castellany to the Hospitallers.¹⁹⁶ The move was of momentous importance for the fortunes of the Despotate, for the presence of the Knights in the area had an immediate effect: Corinth was spared from destruction and Navarrese incursions into Byzantine territory came to an abrupt halt. However, the renewed Turkish attack in 1399 and early 1400 compelled Theodore sometime early in the latter year to accept the new offer made by the Hospitallers to buy up the whole of the Despotate. There is no doubt that with the resumption of Turkish hostilities the Knights were anxious to strengthen their defensive position. The Hospitallers' offer came at the right moment, and in fact fitted Theodore's plans to use them as a lever to dislodge the Turks from the Morea, but always with the intention of reclaiming his possessions from the Knights once the Turkish danger had been removed.¹⁹⁷ However, the transactions did not proceed as anticipated. The inhabitants of Mistra rebelled, and Theodore had no alternative but to begin negotiations for the retrocession. On the other hand, his negotiations with the Hospitallers induced Bayezid to offer a truce, with the sole condition that the Hospitallers withdrew from the Peloponnese.¹⁹⁸

Meanwhile, in 1399 the emperor renewed his appeal to the west for military help. France responded by sending Jean le Meingre, Maréchal Boucicaut with a small military contingent. His successes, even if limited, proved that a well-trained army could achieve much. He therefore advised the emperor to travel to Europe and personally appeal to the rulers. Having first reconciled with his nephew John VII, Andronikos VI's son, whom he left in charge of the city, Manuel, accompanied by Boucicaut, set out on 10 December 1399 for his journey, which was to take him to Italy, France and England. John VII, too, like his uncle in the past, would make a number of attempts at a reconciliation with Bayezid, which would prove fruitless. Manuel remained in Europe until 1403 but, despite all the promises, adequate help was never realised.¹⁹⁹ Aid came in a more or less accidental way from a different quarter – from Timur.

196 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 167–3; Loenertz, 'Pour l'histoire du Péloponèse', pp. 254–7.

197 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 161–7.

198 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 205–7; Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 97–8.

199 For Manuel II's journey see J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): a Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick, 1969), pp. 122 ff.; Donald M. Nicol, 'A Byzantine Emperor in England: Manuel II's Visit to London in 1400–1401', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 12, 2 (1971), 204–25, repr. in Nicol, *Byzantium: its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World* (Aldershot, 1972).

As a result of the defeat of the Ottomans by Timur at the battle of Ankara on 28 July 1402, the Ottoman state broke up. Aydın, Saruhan, Teke and Menteşe recovered their independence while the remaining part of the Ottoman state was competed for by Bayezid's sons. The eldest, Süleyman, escaped to the European section, and signed a treaty in 1403 with Byzantium, the Serbian despot Stefan Lazarević and the Christian powers, including Venice and Genoa.²⁰⁰ As a result of the treaty, Thessalonike and a considerable territory in Chalkidike and the littoral of the Thermaic Gulf, all the land from Panidos on the Sea of Marmora to Constantinople and north to Mesembria on the Black Sea coast were restored to the empire. In addition, the status of vassal state and the yearly tribute were cancelled. In Anatolia Mehmed and İsa fought for control. Both, however, lost out to Süleyman who took Bursa in 1404. Süleyman in turn was to fall to another brother, Musa, who defeated and killed him in 1411. Byzantium was faced with a new threat. The sacred war against the Christians was openly taken up again.²⁰¹ The Turkish armies attacked Thessalonike²⁰² and overran Thrace, Thessaly and Serbia – places that had been ceded by Süleyman – and Musa's envoy, İbrahim Paşa, was sent to Constantinople to claim the tribute which had been abolished since 1402.²⁰³ Meanwhile, Venice had concluded a treaty with Musa to safeguard its territories in Albania, Greece and the Aegean.²⁰⁴ Manuel was left to fend for himself. In July 1413 the situation changed once more, this time with the defeat and overthrow of Musa by another of Bayezid's sons, Mehmed (1413–21). Despite occasional Turkish raids, Mehmed I conducted a policy of peaceful co-existence, with both the Byzantines and the Serbs.²⁰⁵ This was to last for almost nine years.

During this period, Manuel II's aim was to consolidate his possessions in the Morea, as he had done earlier after the death of his brother Theodore I in 1407, during the minority of his own son Theodore II, who succeeded his uncle. After the peace treaty with Mehmed I, Manuel returned to the Morea in

200 G. T. Dennis, 'The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88; P. Wittek, 'De la défaite d'Ankara à la prise de Constantinople', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 12 (1938), pp. 16 ff.

201 That Musa saw the fight against Byzantium as *cihad* is made clear in Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, pp. 91–2.

202 12.1.1417: Thiriet, *Régestes*, vol. II (Paris, 1959), no. 1635, § 8, p. 150.

203 Saadeddin, *Chronica dell'origine e processi della Casa Ottomana*, tr. V. Brattuti (Vienna, 1649), p. 313.

204 N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XVe siècle*, vol. I (Paris, 1899–1900), 4.vi.1411, pp. 196–9; C. N. Sathas, *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, 9 vols. (Paris, 1881), II, 7.vi.1411, no. 527, pp. 262–3.

205 Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 178–83.

1415 via Thessalonike where his son Andronikos had now succeeded his uncle John VII. His main task in the Morea was to construct the defensive wall of Hexamillion across the isthmus of Corinth, a project in which Theodore had tried for years to involve the Venetians without success.²⁰⁶ Despite objections from some large landowners, the majority of the population, including the Albanians who led a nomadic existence and consequently felt more vulnerable to Turkish incursions, offered their labour or materials to ensure that the wall was speedily completed to provide safety to the inhabitants. Its completion, however, did not apparently please the sultan, though originally he seems to have given his consent.²⁰⁷ Aware of Mehmed's attitude and the possibility that he might try to destroy the wall, Venice ordered its castellans of Coron and Modon to give every assistance to the emperor in the event of a Turkish assault on the Hexamillion.²⁰⁸

This was an ominous sign. Soon after, freed from his campaign against Karaman, Mehmed turned his attention to the Aegean, ravaged the islands and attacked Venetian merchant shipping on its way from the Black Sea to Negroponte. Manuel II's proposal for a concerted policy was never taken up, not even after the Turkish raids on the island which carried away 1,500 people into slavery.²⁰⁹ The Veneto-Turkish confrontation ended with the defeat of Mehmed's navy off Gelibolu on 29 May 1416, followed by a treaty signed three years later.²¹⁰

For the Byzantines the situation deteriorated further with Mehmed's death and the accession of his son Murad II (1421–44, 1446–51), who followed an aggressive policy reminiscent of that of his grandfather, Bayezid I. Manuel II's elder son and co-emperor, John VIII, then in charge of the government, tried to use a Turkish pretender, Mustafa, who in 1416 had claimed to be a son of Bayezid I. Contrary to Manuel II's advice to come to an understanding with Murad II, John opted to support Mustafa in his bid for the Ottoman throne. The attempt failed. Mustafa was captured and put to death.²¹¹ Immediately

206 *MP*, no. 153, p. 301; no. 157, p. 309; no. 168, p. 337; nos. 180–1, pp. 361–2; no. 187, p. 374; no. 192, pp. 382–3; no. 193, pp. 384–7; no. 210, p. 410; nos. 230–1, pp. 466, 469.

207 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Letters*, no. 68, pp. 208–11, 216–17.

208 23.vii.1415: Sathas, *Documents*, III, no. 668, p. 116.

209 23.ix.1415: Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1592, p. 138; 4.ii.1416: no. 1598, p. 140. He raised the question again in 12.i.1417: no. 1635, p. 150.

210 6.xi.1419: *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levanticum*, II, pp. 318–19.

211 George Sphrantzes, *Cronaca*, ed. and tr. R. Maisano (Rome, 1990), IV, p. 10 § 4, viii, p. 18 § 3, ix, p. 20 §§ 3, 4; English tr. by M. Philippides, *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire: a Chronicle by George Sphrantzes, 1401–1477* (Amherst, 1980), pp. 23, 26, 27; cf. Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 222–7. Manuel, by then ailing, had relinquished the affairs of state to his son. He died in 1425.

afterwards, Murad laid siege to Constantinople, but its walls proved invincible, for the cannons at the sultan's disposal, supposedly German, proved ineffective. Faced with a new rival, his young brother, another Mustafa, Murad was forced to withdraw.²¹²

Though he had failed with Constantinople, Murad kept up the pressure. In the spring of 1423 his armies, under Turahan, invaded the Peloponnese, stormed the fortifications, destroyed the wall of Hexamillion and devastated the area.²¹³ Some months later the Byzantines succeeded in signing a peace treaty, according to which they became once more tributaries to the Turks. Despite the invasion, the Peloponnese showed tenacity to survive. The political continuity, maintained by Manuel II during the minority of his son Theodore II, and later by John VIII and Constantine IX, had given the Despotate new vigour. With the exception of the Venetian colonies, the rest of the Peloponnese was thus unified under Byzantine rule, despite Murad's attack and the devastation of 1446; it was to survive until after the fall of Constantinople.²¹⁴

Ottoman pressure on both land and sea, however, remained relentless. Even the Hospitallers in Rhodes felt the impact and sought refuge in Venetian protection. In the summer of 1423 they offered Rhodes to the Signoria in exchange for territories of equal value, either in Negroponte or in the Peloponnese.²¹⁵ This proposal was never realised. Rhodes remained in Hospitaller hands until 1522. But in the same year Manuel's third son, Despot Andronikos, then ruling Thessalonike, decided to hand over the city to the Venetians.²¹⁶ Such a solution was inevitably unacceptable to the sultan. Despite the prolonged diplomatic missions and the willingness of the Venetians to reach a compromise or even support a pretender, the attempt failed. On 29 March 1430 the city was captured.²¹⁷

With the capture of Thessalonike, the pressures on Constantinople increased. John VIII seems to have believed that salvation could come only from the west, to be accomplished through the union of the two churches – a

212 Sphrantzes, *Cronaca*, x, p. 22 § 2; xi, pp. 22–3 §§ 1–3 (Philippides, pp. 27–8); Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 231–3.

213 Sphrantzes, *Cronaca*, xii, p. 24 § 1 (Philippides, p. 28); Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 238–9.

214 Zakythinos, *Le despotat*, I, pp. 204 ff.

215 8.vi.1423: Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1886, p. 204.

216 7.vii.1423: Sathas, *Documents*, I, no. 86, pp. 133–9, 27.vii.1423: no. 89, pp. 141–50.

217 John Anagnostes, *Διήγησις περί τῆς τελευταίας ἀλώσεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Μονωδία ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης*, ed. Y. Tsaras (Thessalonike, 1958); S. Vryonis, 'The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki', in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantium and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Bryer and H. Lowry (Birmingham and Washington, DC, 1986), pp. 281–321.

solution that in the past had been sought, unsuccessfully, by his predecessors Michael VIII and John V. Conditions looked promising. In contrast to the earlier position when any agreement presupposed the prior recognition of papal ecclesiastical supremacy, now, as a result of the western conciliar movement and the Council of Constance (1414), any decision concerning the union fell under the jurisdiction of the council, to which the pope had to adhere. This raised the hopes of the Byzantines that the doctrinal, ecclesiastical and liturgical differences between the two churches would be discussed at a council, as they had always insisted, on equal terms, and not dictated by the pope. Despite Manuel's advice for caution concerning the union,²¹⁸ John went ahead with his plan. On 24 November 1437 he travelled to the west with a large delegation. After protracted theological discussions and disputes, the proclamation of the union of the churches was issued in Florence on 6 July 1439.²¹⁹ Instead of the much-hoped for help from the west against the Ottomans, the union, as Manuel II had predicted, brought internal dissension, and in addition alienated the Byzantines from the rest of the Orthodox world, in particular Russia.

After concluding agreements with Serbia, Hungary and Karaman, Murad II abdicated, leaving the throne to his young son Mehmed II. He returned almost immediately, however, to lead the Ottoman armies against the last combined, but inadequately prepared and non-coordinated, attempt of the Christian forces against the Ottomans under Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini. This force was defeated on 10 November 1444 at Varna. Two years later, once more back on the throne, Murad carried out attacks into the Peloponnese. His artillery destroyed the wall of Hexamillion, rebuilt only a few years before, and took 60,000 people into captivity,²²⁰ reducing the Despotate to a vassal state, and at the same time putting an end to the idea of a united independent Greek Despotate of the Morea under John VIII's brother, Constantine. On the death of John, Constantine XI was crowned emperor in the Peloponnese on 6 January 1449, and two months later he arrived in Constantinople. Despite his ability, courage and tenacity he could not have saved the city. Constantinople lay like an island in the midst of an Ottoman ocean. The new sultan, Mehmed II (1444–6, 1446–51), was determined to succeed where his father had failed. An astute and outstanding tactician, he began his preparations by building the fortress of Rumeli Hisarı on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus, by means of

218 Sphrantzes, *Cronaca*, xxiii, p. 82 §§ 5–7 (Philippides, p. 50).

219 Sylvestre Syropoulos, *Les 'Mémoires' du Grand Ecclésiarche de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439)* (Rome, 1971); J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959).

220 Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, xxxiii. pp. 222–3; 19.x.1447: Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, iii, p. 221.

which he encircled the city and kept control on the movements of ships. On hearing the news of this undertaking, the people in Constantinople knew that the end of the city had come.²²¹

Constantine XI's appeals to the west produced some help but not enough to stem Ottoman progress. The west had no co-ordinated strategy against the Turkish advance. Each country viewed the question of Constantinople from the viewpoint of its own interests and ambitions, and success was therefore impossible. It remained up to individuals, primarily Venetians and Genoese, to make the last stand.²²² The fortifications of Constantinople had in the past protected the city, but could not withstand the new artillery, built by the Hungarian Orban who, unable to sell his cannon in Constantinople, had crossed to the other side and offered it to the Ottomans.²²³ As Kritoboulos wrote, this 'cannon decided the whole issue'.²²⁴ The city fell on 29 May 1453, followed by a three-day pillage and its accompanying destruction.²²⁵ Thus closed the history of an empire that had lasted more than a thousand years.

The pacification of Anatolia took four hundred years finally to be established, and this was brought about by the ability of the Ottoman Turks to impose their authority. The destruction and suffering that occurred in those intervening years, as a result of the vacuum of centralised political power, are documented by Byzantine historians, contemporary to the events. Though, inevitably, their narrative centres on the political, social and economic devastation brought about by the Turkic tribes, there are glimpses of strong relations developing between the two peoples, divided by language, religion and customs. As early as John II Komnenos's reign, Choniates reports that the Christians inhabiting the islets of Lake Pousgouse (Beyşehir Gölü) became friends with the Turks of Konya, allied with them and 'looked upon the Romans as their enemies. Thus custom', as Choniates observes, 'reinforced by time is stronger than race and religion.'²²⁶

221 Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, pp. 237–8; Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, pp. 382–3.

222 Besides the Byzantine historians on the conquest of the city, see also the eye-witness account of Nicolò Barbaro, *Giornale dell'assedio di Costantinopoli 1453*, ed. E. Cornet (Vienna, 1856), tr. by J. R. Jones as *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople* (New York, 1969).

223 Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, p. 385.

224 Michael Kritoboulos, *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. D. R. Reinsch (Berlin, 1983), p. 46: 'εὐρημα τοῦτον Γερμανῶν καὶ Κελτῶν'.

225 In addition to the primary sources, see also S. Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople 1453* (Cambridge, 1961; repr. 1965); R. Browning, 'A Note on the Capture of Constantinople', *Byzantion* 22 (1952), 379–86.

226 Choniates, *Historia*, I, pp. 37–8 (Magoulas, p. 22): οὕτω χρόνῳ κρατηθὲν ἔθος γένους καὶ θρησκείας ἔστιν ἰσχυρότερον; cf. Kinnamos, *Epitome*, p. 22 (Brand, p. 26).

On another social level, offering an example of co-existence and assimilation in the opposite direction are the Axouchs – a family which held a distinguished position in the political life of the empire under the Komnenoi. The first Axouch, a Turkish boy, was given as a present to Alexios I following the peaceful surrender of Nicaea (İznik) in June 1097 and the exchange of gifts between the emperor and the Turks. The young Axouch and John II, then both ten years old, were brought up together in the palace and became inseparable friends. Subsequently Axouch rose to the high position of grand domestic; his son Alexios, ‘an energetic man expert in military science, with a tongue as sharp as his mind and dignified in appearance’, acted as *protostrator* under Manuel I.²²⁷

This ‘co-existence’, even as enemies, seems at times to have led the Byzantines to try to assess and acknowledge their opponents’ strengths. An example of this is Manuel II Palaeologos’s evaluation of the Ottoman success, in an attempt to identify Turkish strengths vis-à-vis Byzantine weaknesses. From his personal experience he considered that their achievement on the battlefield stemmed from the fact that not only were the Turkish army more numerous, but also, and more importantly, ‘they were brave, experienced in warfare, well-trained . . . gradually over a long period of time to bear the hardships and pains . . . when others would not have remained even in a friendly country producing all good things’.²²⁸

This self-evaluation and rational exploration, reflected also in Manuel’s *Dialogues with a Muterriz*,²²⁹ derive from that long tradition of the classical world, for which Byzantium acted not only as a repository but also as an appreciative guardian of its inestimable value, to be transmitted to the west shortly before and after the fall of Constantinople. The question arises as to what extent this civilisation influenced the new power, the Ottomans, that rose on what had been the Byzantine Empire. To what extent can it be said that ‘the new society (Turkic-Muslim) differed from those of Asiatic steppe and of the Islamic Middle East because it arose in a Byzantine milieu’?²³⁰

227 Choniates, *Historia*, I, pp. 9–10, 97 (Magoulias, pp. 7–8, 56); cf. Kinnamos, *Epitome*, p. 5 (Brand, p. 14). For Nicaea see Anna Komnene, *Alexiade*, III, book XI, II, pp. 13 ff. (Sewter, pp. 337 ff.).

228 Manuel II Palaeologos, *Funeral Oration*, pp. 158–9.

229 Trapp, *Dialogue*, p. 5, the word deriving, as the editor notes, from the Arabic *mudarris*.

230 Vryonis, *Decline*, p. 1.

Anatolia under the Mongols

CHARLES MELVILLE

The period of Mongol rule in Anatolia, that is, roughly the century between the battle of Köseadağ in 1243 and the collapse of the Ilkhanid regime in the 1340s, if mentioned at all, is generally treated only as a brief preamble to the rise of the Ottomans. Even then, as in the nationalist histories of Russia and China, Mongol rule is seen as an unwelcome interlude that wrecked the country and left no formative traces. Rather, traditional Ottoman Turkish history arises seamlessly out of the history of the Seljuks of Rum, the principal, though latterly only notional, rulers of central Anatolia between their victory over the Byzantines at Malazgirt (Manzikert) in 1071 and their obscure demise in the early fourteenth century. By this time, one of the beyliks that was later the kernel of the Ottoman state was already in existence, among numerous others. According to Kafesoğlu, for example, this beylik 'on the western frontier of the Seljuk state (*sic*), with regard to its moral fibre and organization, acquired many values from Seljuk Turkishness' and 'kept Anatolia as a Turkish motherland'.¹ At the other end of the spectrum, comparisons have been drawn between the formation and development of the Mongol and Ottoman empires, with no reference at all to the Mongols in Anatolia.²

Others have been ready to examine in more detail late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Anatolian society, in which the Ilkhanate was the dominant power. Numismatists in particular have recently taken another look at the traditional view, and have emphasised the continuity of Ottoman from Ilkhanid

1 İ. Kafesoğlu, *A History of the Seljuks*, ed. and tr. G. Leiser as *A History of the Seljuks: İbrahim Kafesoğlu's Interpretation and the Resulting Controversy* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1988), p. 78; cf. O. Turan, 'Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks', in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. I, ed. P. M. Holt, Ann K. S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 248–51; Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1976), I, p. 9; also recently, Henir Stierlin, *Turkey: From Seljuks to the Ottomans* (Cologne and London, 2002), e.g. pp. 1, 23, 79.

2 İ. Togan, 'Ottoman History by Inner Asian Norms', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 18, 3–4 (1991), 185–210.

practices.³ Yet here too, interest in the Mongols arises solely in connection with the circumstances in which the Ottoman state emerged. It is difficult, with hindsight, to look at the Mongol period without regard to later Turkish history.

Just as the historians of Turkey impose their own vision on Anatolian affairs, so the historians of the Ilkhanate (primarily an Iranian regime, in a geographical sense at least) have tended to ignore the situation in Anatolia unless it impinged directly on events at the *ordu* (Mongol court). Rum has been dubbed the Mongol 'Wild West': a land of opportunity, perhaps, only loosely under central control, and even a province where the 'unprecedented mildness' of the Mongol regime has been noted.⁴ To evaluate such views, we should treat the affairs of Anatolia as part of the larger Ilkhanid state. This underwent various phases of development, which furthermore had similar corollaries in other provinces of the Ilkhanate too, such as Fars and Khurasan.

It is important to recall that the Ilkhanid regime was centred in Azerbaijan in north-west Iran, orientated east rather than west, and essentially uninterested in the border regions with Byzantium. Mongol relations with the Christian west remained on the whole cordial; of far more concern were the borders in south-east Anatolia, with Mamluk Syria, and in the north with the Golden Horde.

The territories of Mongol Rum were not contiguous with those of modern Turkey in Asia Minor. To the north, hugging the eastern Black Sea coast, the Christian kingdom of Trebizond (Trabzon) maintained its independence until after the fall of Byzantium. East of Erzurum was the province of Greater Armenia, including the important summer quarters at Aladağ, scene of the coronation of several Ilkhans. Lesser Armenia (Cilicia) continued to cling to a separate existence south of the Taurus mountains throughout the period, while further east Diyar Bekr (Diyarbakır) was a separate governorship and remained culturally and politically more bound up with the Arab lands of

3 M. F. Köprülü, *The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. and tr. G. Leiser (Albany, 1992), esp. ch. 2; Zeki Velidi Togan, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1970), pp. 332–3, cited in C. Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1995), pp. 44–5; Cl. Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane* (Istanbul and Paris, 1988), rev. edn of *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, tr. J. Jones-Williams (London, 1968); F. Sümer, 'Anadolu'da Moğollar', *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1969), 1–147. See also Rudi P. Lindner, 'How Mongol were the Early Ottomans?', in *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, ed. R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan (Leiden, 1999), pp. 282–3; Ş. Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge, 2000), esp. pp. 28–34.

4 S. Blair, 'The Coins of the Later Ilkhānids: Mint Organization, Regionalization, and Urbanism', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 27 (1982), p. 219; J. M. Rogers, review of F. Sümer 'Anadolu'da Moğollar', *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1969), 1–47, in *Kunst des Orients* 7, 1 (1970–1), 167.

Upper Mesopotamia. These regions come only briefly into focus in the story of Ilkhanid Anatolia. The Turkicisation of the southern peripheries of Rum was nevertheless one of the long-term results of the Mongol invasions and of the changes that they brought with them in the ethnic composition of the population, in the form of semi-nomadic Turkoman pastoralists who in time came to exercise political power throughout the region.⁵

The successors of Chinggis Han

The orderly succession of Chinggis Han's son Ögedei in 1229 ensured that his remarkable victories would not be wasted. Almost immediately, Ögedei began the process of consolidating and extending the Mongol conquests in the west (which had not affected Anatolia directly), sending his general Chormaghun to subdue the fugitive Harezmşah Celaledin Mingbarni. His disruptive exploits in the region round Lake Van no doubt helped to draw the Mongols towards Seljuk territory: a possibility that the sultan, Alaeddin Keykubad (1220–37), had anxiously anticipated in his exchanges with Celaledin's envoys.⁶

Chormaghun is reported to have pillaged the country around Sivas in 1232, but he soon withdrew to the Mughan plain; the Mongols were preoccupied at this time with subduing Georgia. A more diplomatic approach came from the Great Han in 1236, inviting the Seljuk sultan to submit. Keykubad agreed but soon afterwards died. His successor, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II (1247–53), acquiesced, but by the time a military governor (*basqaq*) from the Han arrived, Ögedei himself was dead and the Mongol general Baiju had annihilated the Seljuk army at Kösedag, on Friday 26 June 1243.⁷ Mongol dominion in Anatolia was now a military reality, not just a diplomatic nicety.

Throughout the territories they encountered, the Mongols either accepted the submission of the existing regime or replaced it with direct rule. Ögedei's summonses had gone out to other rulers whose lands had not been affected by the first wave of Mongol invasions, particularly in southern Iran, where

5 Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 3; Cl. Cahen, 'Contribution à l'histoire du Diyar Bakr au quatorzième siècle', *Journal Asiatique* 243 (1955), 92–8.

6 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya fi'l-umur al-'ala'iyya*, facs. ed. Adnan Sadik Erzi, *El-Evāmirü'l-'Alā'iyye fi'l-umūri'l-'Alā'iyye* (Ankara, 1956), p. 377; Ibn Bibi, anonymous abbr. ed. M. Th. Houtsma, in *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides*, vol. IV (Leiden, 1902), p. 161.

7 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 454–6; ed. Houtsma, pp. 203–5; Ibn al-'Ibri (Bar Hebraeus), *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal* (Beirut, 1992), p. 249 (under 630/1233); Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-fikra fi ta'rikh al-hijra*, ed. D. S. Richards (Berlin, 1998), pp. 20–2; al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab*, vol. XXVII, ed. S. 'Ashur (Cairo, 1405/1985), pp. 106–7 (under 654/1256).

local dynasties (often Turkish atabegates) controlled Fars, Yazd, Kirman and elsewhere. Their very number well illustrates the fragmentation of the former Seljuk Empire to which the Mongols fell heir.

The situation in Anatolia was complicated by the fact that the Seljuks had now suffered military defeat, despite having submitted in principle. Baiju was probably acting on the orders of Batu Han, son of Jochi, in order to acquire additional territories on his own account, taking advantage of the death of Ögedei in 1241 and the incapacity of his commander Chormaghun.⁸ Anatolia thus came initially under the aegis of the Mongols of the Deşti-Kıpçak, later popularly known as the Golden Horde, and only more loosely under the distant authority of Qaraqorum.

The survival of the Seljuk sultanate was due to the statesmanship of the *vezir*, Mühezzibeddin, who negotiated surrender on terms that at least ensured its continuation under Mongol suzerainty, if at a cost. This was made up in cash and kind, largely in the form of animals, to be paid annually to the Mongols' envoys (*ilchi*); some reports estimate the tribute at 400,000 *dinars*. Shortly afterwards, a follow-up embassy to Batu confirmed Sultan Keyhüsrev II as governor on his behalf, with the titles Nizamü'l-mülk and Salah al-'alam.⁹

The reign of Keyhüsrev coincided with the long interregnum before the succession of Güyük son of Ögedei as Great Han in 1246. In the next decade, preoccupied with their own difficulties, the Mongols did little more than confirm or reconfirm the status of a sequence of would-be sultans, as well as their officials. The Mongols were masters at exploiting the divisions that now emerged, such as had long been endemic in the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional Seljuk state.

Keyhüsrev's death in 1246 left three sons who were, disastrously, all minors and thus quickly under the influence of different factions at court. The new *vezir*, Şemseddin İsfahanlı, installed the eldest son, İzzeddin Keykavus II (aged eleven) on the throne, flanked by his younger brothers. The *vezir* also married İzzeddin's mother, the daughter of a Greek priest.¹⁰

8 P. Jackson, 'The Dissolution of the Mongol Empire', *Central Asiatic Journal* 22 (1978), 216–19.

9 Al-Dhahabi, *Kitab duwal al-Islam*, tr. Arlette Negre as *Les dynasties de l'Islam* (Damascus, 1979), pp. 243, 246; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 534–5, 542–3 (Houtsma, pp. 244–5, 248); Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 232; P. Jackson with D. O. Morgan, *The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck* (London, 1990), pp. 247–8, quoting especially the evidence of Simon of Saint-Quentin.

10 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, ed. M. Raushan and M. Musavi, 4 vols. (Tehran, 1373/1994), iv, p. 815; tr. J. A. Boyle as *The Successors of Genghis Khan* (London and New York, 1971), p. 191; 'Ibn al-Fuwati', *Kitab al-hawadith*, ed. B.'A. Ma'ruf and 'I.'A. Ru'uf (Baghdad, 1997), pp. 246–7; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 22. See also Rudi P. Lindner,

Keyhüsrev had previously intended to send the middle son, Rükneddin, to the Great Han and eventually, after several summonses, he was sent to attend the *quriltay* (assembly) to elect Güyük in August 1246. In Qaraqorum, Güyük appointed Eljigidei to be his representative in the west, responsible for Anatolia, Georgia, Armenia, Aleppo and Mosul, so that the local rulers would be directly answerable to him for their tribute (that is, Batu's agents would be bypassed). We thus see Güyük attempting to assert his authority over this outlying part of the empire. He ordered Rükneddin to be installed as sultan of Rum (as Kılıç Arslan IV) in place of his elder brother İzzeddin: partly, perhaps, to undermine the regime installed with the blessing of Batu Han. Güyük gave Rükneddin the daughter of the general Eljigidei and the support of his army. Eljigidei seems to have got no further than Khurasan,¹¹ but Rükneddin returned with a Mongol force 2,000 strong to assert his claims.

Despite the divisions between those looking to the Byzantines and the pro-Mongol faction, whose orientation is expressed in a new coinage minted at Sivas in 646/1248,¹² the Seljuk officials' first reaction to Güyük's decree was an attempt to maintain the unity of the sultanate. In practice, however, the rivalry between İzzeddin and Rükneddin (and more importantly, their supporters) could only be resolved by force, and at a skirmish near Aksaray (Aqsaray), Rükneddin was defeated and captured, on 14 June 1249. Thereafter, if not before, a compromise was reached, that all three brothers were to rule jointly. The Han's envoys were involved in all these deliberations.¹³

A formal division of territory, if not authority, probably preceded the decision to try joint rule. On the return of the embassy to Güyük, Konya, Aksaray, Ankara, Antalya and the west were allocated to İzzeddin and Kayseri, Sivas, Malatya, Erzincan and Erzurum to Rükneddin. Alaeddin, the youngest brother, was given sufficient estates from the crown lands (*amlak al-khassa*) for his

'The Challenge of Qılıç Arslan IV', in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History: Studies in Honor of George C. Miles*, ed. D. K. Kouymjian (Beirut, 1974), p. 411; Jackson, *William of Rubruck*, pp. 276–7; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, p. 565 (Houtsma, p. 260).

11 'Ata-Malik Juvaini, *Tarikh-i Jahangusha*, ed. M. Qazvini, 3 vols. (London, 1912, 1916, 1937), I, pp. 205, 212; tr. J. A. Boyle, *The History of the World Conqueror*, 2 vols. (Manchester, 1958), pp. 250, 257; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 808 (Boyle, p. 183); Juzjani, *Tabaqat-i Nasiri*, vol. I, ed. A. Habibi, repr. (Tehran, 1363/1984), p. 265; cf. P. Jackson, 'Eljigidei', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (Costa Mesa, 1998), VIII, pp. 366–7.

12 Lindner, 'Challenge', pp. 414–15.

13 Anonymous [hereafter cited as Anon.], *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq dar Anatuli*, ed. Nadira Jalali (Tehran, 1377/1999), p. 96; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 589–93 (Houtsma, pp. 267–9); Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 234–5; Lindner, 'Challenge', p. 417; Rudi P. Lindner, 'Hordes and Hoards in Late Saljuq Anatolia', in *The Art of the Saljuqs in Iran and Anatolia*, ed. R. Hillenbrand (Costa Mesa, 1994), p. 281.

needs.¹⁴ This was the first of many similar divisions, and an arrangement typical of Mongol government in other provinces of the Ilkhanate. Ultimately, it became consolidated into a geopolitical reality that endured until the Ottoman expansion of the early sixteenth century united the western and eastern Anatolian lands.

The joint rule of the brothers evidently worked well until the death of Karatay, İzzeddin's right-hand man, in November 1254.¹⁵ By this time Güyük had died and Möngke son of Tolui had been elected Great Han (July 1251), thanks to Batu Han's support. This could only increase Batu's control over the empire's western territories, although the actual demarcation of authority between Batu and Möngke's representative, Arghun Aqa, is not clear.

The same pattern of events was now repeated, as a series of Mongol envoys summoned İzzeddin in person to Möngke's court.¹⁶ It was eventually decided to send the youngest brother, Alaeddin, son of the Georgian princess Tamara. All sources agree that Alaeddin was treacherously murdered in the course of this mission, though accounts differ as to the timing; at any rate, a group of emirs accompanying the embassy on behalf of İzzeddin had succeeded in negotiating his confirmation as sultan, when news arrived of his resistance to Baiju (see below), whereupon, the rival party urged the claims of Rükneddin. Möngke's solution, later to be applied by Hülegü, was another formal division of the sultanate.¹⁷

Meanwhile, in the absence of Alaeddin's embassy, the two elder brothers quickly fell out. A second, more serious confrontation took place and Rükneddin was again defeated. This time, despite another showy reconciliation, he was imprisoned, first in Amasya and later, allegedly as a result of the wretched climate there, transferred to Burghlu (Uluborlu) in the south-western frontier region (*uc*).¹⁸

If the administration of the sultanate remained largely intact in this first phase of Mongol sovereignty, it was inevitably vitiated by the divisions of

¹⁴ Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, pp. 257–8.

¹⁵ Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, *Musamarat al-akhbar wa musayarat al-akhyar*, ed. O. Turan as *Müsâmeret ü-l-ahbâr: Moğollar Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarih* (Ankara, 1944), p. 38; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 97.

¹⁶ Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 604, 608 (Houtsma, pp. 275, 277); Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 263.

¹⁷ Compare Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 630–31 (Houtsma, pp. 292–4); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 38–9; Mustaufi, *Tarikh-i Guzida*, ed. 'A. Nava'i (Tehran, 1362/1983), p. 478; Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 264; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 26–30; al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat*, vol. XXVII, pp. 107–9; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 246.

¹⁸ Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 615–16 (Houtsma, pp. 282–3); Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 264; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 40; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 97; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 239.

authority among the Seljuk princes and their advisers, and by the readiness of ambitious officials to resort directly to the *ordu* for advancement. Such missions had another purpose: to petition against the increasing burden of Mongol demands. Kadı İzzeddin Razi, in his second vezirate (1250–6), was sufficiently alarmed by the importunities of Baiju and other *noyans* (commanders) to send the *emir-dad* (chief of justice), Fahreddin Ali, to Qaraqorum with lavish presents and a petition. Alaeddin's embassy to Möngke also had as one of its objectives to complain of the destruction being caused by Baiju, which according to the Mamluk historian Baibars al-Mansuri was particularly associated with a devastating raid distinct from the invasions of 1243 and 1256. Fahreddin Ali's mission, returning via Baiju, received some assurances and thereafter the *ilchis* were willing to reduce their demands.¹⁹

After his success (which is not reflected in any surviving coin issues), İzzeddin received embassies from neighbouring rulers, both Christian and Muslim, notably the Caliph. Some semblance of recovery may have been anticipated, when Baiju unexpectedly moved once more into Anatolia in force, on the orders of Möngke Han, to make room in the Mughan plain for Hülegü's troops.

The formation of the Ilkhanate under Hülegü

Möngke's despatch of his brother Hülegü to consolidate the western conquests inaugurated a new phase of Mongol rule. At first, given the concord between the Jochids and the Toluids, Baiju's migration into Anatolia might have strengthened the Golden Horde's connections with the province. Before long, however, a chain of events brought Anatolia under the jurisdiction of the Ilkhanid regime, opportunistically established by Hülegü after the death of Möngke in 1259.

Initially, Baiju merely requested pasturelands, but Sultan İzzeddin rashly determined to resist him. He was possibly justified by the seeming violation of the Mongols' agreements as to the nature and extent of their demands on the province. The *vezir*, Kadı İzzeddin, advocated *cihad* (*jihad*) against the Mongols, while Sultan İzzeddin perhaps refused Baiju's request for winter quarters in the belief that his forces were actually fleeing from Hülegü. Finally, the two sides met near Aksaray on 15 October 1256 and the Seljuk forces

19 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 617–18 (Houtsma, pp. 283–4); Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 26, 29 (under 655/1257). For other embassies, see also Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 97 (to Batu), 100 (to Möngke); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 41 (to Güyük and Möngke); Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 238, 240; cf. Jackson, *William of Rubruck*, p. 247.

were defeated, in part as a result of the defection of their commander, Arslan Doğmuş.²⁰ The sultan fled first to Konya, then to Antalya and so on to İznik (Nicaea).

Baiju was deflected from his intention of sacking Konya by heavy cash payments and, according to Eflaki, by the sanctity of the city protected by the famous Sufi Celaeddin Rumi and the tomb of his father. Baiju's wife may also have interceded for the city. Nevertheless, the fortifications were dismantled. The blessing of a very mild winter saved the province from exactions that it could not support. Baiju made his winter quarters near Aksaray and established military governors (*shihnagan*) in the town. After the flight of İzzeddin, his brother Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan, always recognised as sultan by the Mongol authorities, was freed from his confinement in Uluborlu and officially installed in Konya on 6 March 1257.²¹

This was only a temporary resolution of the situation. In the spring, Hülegü received Baiju in Hamadan and called him to account for his actions since replacing Chormaghun. He was then sent back to prepare his forces for the coming attack on Baghdad.²² When İzzeddin heard Baiju had left the province, he returned and entered Konya (2 May 1257), accompanied by Byzantine troops.²³ Some time thereafter, Rükneddin also resorted to Hülegü, who was again in Hamadan in the autumn and received the sultan graciously, with a *yarligh* (decree) bestowing on him the sultanate throughout the country. Back in Erzincan, the rivalry between the two brothers continued. It was apparently at this stage, late in 1257, that the embassy to Möngke Han, originally led by Alaeddin, returned, leading to a division of Seljuk territory, but under the single *vezirate* of Baba Tuğrai.²⁴ Coins minted in Sivas by Rükneddin, in Şavval and Zilkade 655/October–November 1257, reflect his reinstatement, but the antagonism persisted and even intensified. İzzeddin had considerable success in reoccupying central Anatolia, and was able to seize Tokat, seat of Sultan Rükneddin's chief supporter, Muineddin Süleyman, of whom we will shortly

20 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 98; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 618–22 (Houtsma, pp. 284–7); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 41–2; cf. Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 264; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 31–2 (re. Arslan Doğmuş).

21 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 98; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 42–3; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, ed. T. Yazıcı as *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri*, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1959), I, pp. 258–62, 722; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 32–3; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 243.

22 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 993–4; cf. Rashid al-Din, *Successors*, p. 304, n. 244.

23 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 626–7 (Houtsma, p. 290); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 98; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 49, says he had 3,000 troops, but cf. S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, 1971), p. 234.

24 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 997; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 244–7.

hear more. Defeated at first, Muineddin resorted to the *ordu* for reinforcements. These, under the command of Alıncak Noyan, installed Rükneddin at Niksar. Rival issues of coinage in Sivas on a monthly basis in the first half of 656/1258 appear to confirm the broad sequence of these events given by Ibn Bibi, although all other sources date Alıncak's intervention only after Hülegü's Syrian campaign, a version that otherwise has much to recommend it.²⁵

It is not surprising that Hülegü considered it necessary to enforce the division established by Möngke. After the capture of Baghdad, he summoned the two brothers to an audience near Tabriz in August 1258. On the intercession of his chief wife, Dokuz Hatun, Hülegü pardoned İzzeddin for resisting Baiju's advance into Anatolia, and confirmed him as ruler of the region from Kayseri down to the coast at Antalya, with Konya as capital. Rükneddin had the former Danişmend region from Sivas to Sinop and Samsun, with the capital at Tokat or Kayseri. As important was the appointment of officials to the two princes. A coin issued for Rükneddin in Sivas in Ramazan 656/September 1258 confirms the settlement.²⁶

The two sultans remained with Hülegü until his invasion of Syria, no doubt to ensure the tranquillity of Anatolia, which was on his flank. They returned to their own territories after the capture of Aleppo in February 1260. Even now, however, the division of rule was neither final nor prolonged. The new administration attempted to extract the debts and tribute owed to the central government. İzzeddin, in Konya, resisted and Alıncak Noyan was sent after him. The sultan again fled west, this time to Byzantium and ultimately to permanent exile under the protection of Möngke Temür, ruler of the Golden Horde.²⁷ In the interval, he started negotiations with the Mamluk sultan, Baibars. On 13 August 1261, Rükneddin was at last installed by the Mongols in Konya as sole sultan; this effectively marked the end of aspirations for it to be an independent sultanate.²⁸

25 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 628–9 (Houtsma, pp. 291–2, cf. note 27); Rudi Paul Lindner, personal communication (coin).

26 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1023; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 60–2; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 98–9; Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 278 (allocations reversed); Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, p. 632 (Houtsma, p. 294); Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 47; Rudi Paul Lindner, personal communication (coin).

27 Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 71–3; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 636–7 (Houtsma, pp. 295–7); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 66–70; George Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, I: *Livres I–III*, ed. and tr. A. Failler and V. Laurent (Paris, 1984), pp. 182–4; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 247–9.

28 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 99; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, p. 635 (Houtsma, p. 295 (Egyptians)); Bar Hebraeus (Ibn al-'Ibri), *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj*, vol. I, tr. E. A. W. Budge (London, 1932), p. 442; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 75; Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir, *al-Rawd al-zahir fi sirat al-malik al-zahir*, ed. 'A. A. Khuwaytir (Riyad, 1396/1976),

More had been resolved than the long-running Seljuk succession crisis. In the first place, Anatolia was now subject to the control of the Ilkhans in Iran rather than the Golden Horde in the Caucasus. The change was accompanied by a new financial dependency. While in Tabriz, the two sultans had been obliged to incur massive debts to the Mongol treasury to equip themselves for Hülegü's Syrian campaign. These were to be repaid by an annual sum (*mukataa*) of 20 *tumans* of cash, 3,000 gold bars, 1,000 horses and mules and 500 rugs and satin textiles. The *vezir*, Baba Tuğrai, also acquired debts that his estate was unable to meet when he died soon afterwards. His dues were added to the sultans' repayments. Furthermore, the Mongols appointed an official to ensure the payment of these obligations, thus entering more directly into the affairs of the province. The first of these agents, backed by the authority of *ilchis* sent by the *ordu*, was Taceddin Mutez, son of a former envoy to the Seljuks from Celaleddin Harezmşah. It was his efforts to raise the sums due from Sultan İzzeddin that set off the sequence of events leading to his flight to Byzantium. Taceddin acquired Kastamonu (formerly held by Baba Tuğrai) as his personal landholding, and the revenues of Aksaray and Develi were included within the tax estimates for Kastamonu to ensure that he had sufficient resources from which to recoup Tuğrai's bad debts.²⁹ Taceddin, although a Mongol agent, soon became remarkably integrated into the local elite.

The continued striking of coins at a variety of mints in the name of Rükneddin must be associated with the need to produce tribute for the Ilkhanid court, rather than any claim to independence by the sultan.³⁰ Issues from Antalya, Konya and Lu'lu'a (Lulon), from 660/1262 onwards, however, would also have underlined the unification of the sultanate after years of division. As elsewhere in the peripheral provinces of the Ilkhanate, coins were not minted in the name of the ruling Ilkhan until much later.

The reunification of the sultanate also saw the consolidation of the chief offices of state. Rükneddin was assisted by Muineddin Süleyman, son of the former *vezir* Mühezzibeddin. Muineddin became Pervane (the sultan's right-hand

pp. 125–7; al-Yunini, *Dhayl Mir'at al-zaman fi ta'rikh al-a'yan*, 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1954–61), II, pp. 160–1; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 250; cf. Jackson, 'Dissolution', p. 238; R. Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks: the Mamluk-Ilkhanid War, 1260–1281* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 158; K. Itani, 'The Rum Sultanate after the Mongol Invasion', *The Toyoshi-Kenkyu* 39, 2 (1980), 5–6.

29 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 633–4 (Houtsma, p. 295); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 62–3, 73.

30 The same situation occurred in Trebizond, A. Bryer, 'The Grand Komnenos and the Great Khan at Karakorum in 1246', *Res Orientales* 6 (1994), 260; A. Bryer, 'The Question of Byzantine Mines in the Pontos: Chalybian Iron, Chaldian Silver, Koloneian Alum and the Mummy of Cheriana', *Anatolian Studies* 32 (1982), 142–4.

man) after Baiju's second invasion in 1256 and continued to enjoy his confidence. In his efforts to undermine İzzeddin's independence of the Mongols, the Pervane invited Fahreddin Ali, former *emir-dad* and *naibüs-saltana* (*na'ib al-saltana*, sultan's deputy) to İzzeddin, to become *vezir*, a post he held with only one interruption for nearly thirty years. Both officials had travelled more than once to the Mongol courts and were viewed with trust, and both knew on which side their bread was buttered. Fahreddin's landholdings included Karahisar and his children acquired Kütahya, Sandıklı, Gorgorum (Ararim) and Akşehir, the basis for the later emirate of Afyon (Karahisar), while the Pervane gained Tokat, Amasya, Niksar and later on, Sinop as essentially autonomous territories.³¹ Fahreddin was responsible for the Persianisation of the financial accounts, which had probably been kept in Arabic until this point because of their essentially mathematical notation. Nevertheless, this underlines the Iranian character of the provincial administration under the Ilkhans.

Whether the Mongols had a much increased physical presence in Rum is difficult to assess. Baiju's arrival in 1256 was a large-scale movement of people: he came with his troops, animals, women and children. It is less obvious in what numbers they stayed. Many doubtless accompanied him on the Baghdad campaign. At some stage soon afterwards, Baiju was eliminated, but evidently not before being put in command of the right wing of the forces mustering to invade Syria. Given his association with the Jochids, he was surely a victim of the hostility already developing after the fall of Baghdad among the rival components of the Mongol army, which led to a mass migration of the Golden Horde's troops into Mamluk territory in 1262. Mamluk sources say that Baiju became a Muslim and was removed when Hülegü had become aware of his reluctance to join the attack on Baghdad.³² His descendants continued to play a role in Rum, most notoriously his grandson Sülemiş, who fled to Mamluk territory with his brother Qutqu in the reign of Ghazan.³³

31 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 599, 624, 636, 643 (Sinop) (Houtsma, pp. 272, 288, 296, 299); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 42–3, 45–6, 63–4 (accounts), 68, 74, 83 (Sinop); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 100 (embassies), see also n. 21; C. Hillenbrand, 'Mu'in al-Din, Parvaneh', *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2006) [henceforth *El2*], vii, pp. 479–80 and 'Mu'in al-Din Parwana: the Servant of Two Masters?', in *Miscellanea Arabica et Islamica*, ed. F. de Jong (Leuven, 1993), pp. 267–74; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 253; J. H. Mordtmann and Fr. Taeschner, 'Afyun Kara Hisar', *El2*, i, p. 243.

32 Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 41; al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat*, xxvii, p. 384; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, i, p. 89.

33 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, p. 625 (Houtsma, p. 289 (Besutai)); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 113, 205 (Qutqu, Sülemiş); Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 210, 1025–6; P. Jackson, 'Bayju', *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, iv, pp. 1–2; Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, p. 160 n. 13; cf. Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 252.

More generally, it is not clear to what extent the Mongols maintained troops permanently in the province. When Alıncak was sent to deal with Sultan İzzeddin, he brought his army from Erzincan, and spent the winter of 1260–1 in the Karahöyük area near Akşehir. After the consolidation of the regime of Sultan Rükneddin, Nabşi is named as the main commander, with summer quarters near Kırşehir; he is still mentioned as an officer in Rum up to the summer of 1276. His son Baltu later rebelled in the time of Ghazan Han (see below).³⁴

Initially, at least, Mongol troops were perhaps present only in small numbers, and scattered in their pasturelands, as in the summer of 1262, when a Karamanid uprising was dealt with by the Seljuk army alone.³⁵ When Prince Ejei assembled a force of approximately 10,000 troops for a raid on northern Syria in October 1271, it consisted of contingents of 1,000 under Iqbal (or Aqbal) son of Baiju and others, and 3,000 under Nabşi, whom Ejei picked up locally, in addition to the 3,000 he brought with him. These figures suggest that, at this time, the largest units in Rum were *hazaras* (1,000s) rather than *tumans* (10,000s).³⁶ For many years, Seljuk forces under the sultan or other leading officers were apparently sufficient to undertake military operations. Otherwise, Mongol reinforcements were sent as required from bases further east. It is likely that their numbers increased only as their involvement in the province deepened.

Unlike some other regions they conquered, central Anatolia was conducive to a permanent Mongol presence. Geographically and climatically, the province formed a continuum with Azerbaijan and Arran and suited the Mongols' transhumant lifestyle, providing the steppe vegetation and high pastures needed to support their alternation between winter and summer quarters. Aladağ, north of Lake Van, in particular, was a favourite summer retreat for the Ilkhanid court and several rulers were crowned there.³⁷

Whether backed up by a considerable military force or not, the divisions in the existing ruling elites, as in Georgia, Fars and Kirman, made it easy for the Mongols to divide and rule, and intervene in local affairs as arbiters of dispute.³⁸ The chance soon arose once more in Anatolia. The Seljuk state, though retaining government, could only operate by the sanction of the Ilkhan.

34 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 85; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, II, pp. 404–5 ('Tabshi'); Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh al-malik al-zahir*, ed. A. Hutayt (Wiesbaden, 1983), pp. 125, 155.

35 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 71–2. 36 Al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, II, pp. 457, 467.

37 See J. Masson-Smith, Jr, 'Mongol Nomadism and Middle Eastern Geography: Qishlaqs and Tümens', in R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan (eds.), *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy* (Leiden, 1999), esp. pp. 48–52.

38 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 933–7 (Boyle, pp. 305–7); A. K. S. Lambton, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia* (Albany, 1988), pp. 271–3, 279–80.

The career of the Pervane, always closely associated with the Mongol camp, represents the outcome of this trend. His success is inseparable from the demise of the sultanate, which was effectively bypassed when Hülegü appointed him governor at the end of his reign. Having already orchestrated the flight of İzzeddin, he now engineered the execution of Sultan Rükneddin, probably shortly after Hülegü's death in 1265; the abbreviator of Ibn Bibi's chronicle gives the date as 9 February 1266, but coins exist for the new sultan already in 663/1265. With the connivance of the Mongol commander, Nabši, the Pervane installed instead Rükneddin's four-year-old son, Gıyaseddin, as Keyhüsrev III.³⁹

Eflaki portrays Celaleddin Rumi's jealousy over the sultan's favour towards a rival *Şeyh* as the cause of Rükneddin's fate; more importantly, he recognises that this was the end of the Seljuk sultanate.⁴⁰ The Pervane's willingness to eliminate Rükneddin, by now in his twenties, throws a certain light on his interest in the fiction of Seljuk legitimacy, and the extent of his personal ambition in serving the Mongols. This question came to a head in the next reign, at a time when the wider importance of the province brought it more closely to the attention of the Ilkhanid government.

The integration of Rum into the Ilkhanate at the expense of the Golden Horde created a new set of relationships between the regional powers. Most significantly, Hülegü's invasion of Syria opened up a war zone that remained active for the next half-century and made Mamluk territory a place of refuge for Anatolian dissidents. Sultan İzzeddin's brief contacts with the Mamluks provide an early example of this. Shared trading interests and a common hostility to the Ilkhans encouraged a commercial and diplomatic axis to develop between Egypt and the Deşti-Kıpçak, which to operate was forced to rely on the sea route through the Bosphorus and thus on Byzantine goodwill. As the Byzantines had to regulate their own relations with the Mongols, both in Crimea and Anatolia, such co-operation was not always forthcoming. The imprisonment of Sultan İzzeddin after taking refuge with his former comrade, Michael VIII Palaeologos, in 1261 is a case in point, though the actions inspired either by himself or by his entourage inflamed what was already a diplomatically awkward situation.⁴¹ On the whole, the Mongols'

39 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 645–8 (Houtsma, pp. 299–303); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 85–6; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 100; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, p. 446; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 116; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, II, pp. 403–5; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1049 (Parvane's appointment); Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 253–5; Lindner, 'Hordes', p. 282.

40 Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, I, pp. 146–7.

41 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 636–9 (Houtsma, pp. 297–8); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 75; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 93–4; Pachymeres, *Relations*, I, pp. 300–8; cf. P. Thorau, *The Lion of Egypt: Sultan Baybars I and the Near East in the Thirteenth Century*,

relations with Byzantium were friendly, and before their conversion to Islam perhaps even more so than those of the Seljuks before them; in both cases, it was the intervening Turkomans, resistant to central control, who generated instability and provoked military confrontation. This was as true of the western borders as of those with Syria.

If the Mamluks represented the greatest external threat to Mongol dominion in Anatolia, the Turkomans provided a permanent source of internal disruption. This had already been demonstrated on the eve of Baiju's first invasion, in the uprising of Baba Resul in 1239–40, and they continued to take advantage of the dissensions within the Seljuk sultanate and of the Mongols' imperfect grip on the province. Initially, Turkoman unrest could be linked with pretence of loyalist support for Seljuk legitimacy.⁴² The Turkoman chief of Denizli (Ladik), Mehmed Bey, initially a supporter of Sultan İzzeddin, was eliminated in 1262, after refusing to present himself to Hülegü. As a result, Mongol control was extended right up to the Byzantine borders. Around the same time, Seljuk forces achieved some success in pacifying the region occupied by the Karamanids, who had attacked Konya; as a result, many Turkomans fled to Syria.⁴³ Subsequent succession crises, or interruptions in strong central government, continued to provide a pretext for the Turkomans to fish in troubled waters, and relentlessly to establish their autonomy in the peripheries of the central plateau.

The threat posed by the combination of Mamluk and Turkoman power was first fulfilled in the reign of Abaqa and was directly responsible for the fall of the Pervane and the ever-tightening grasp of the Mongols on the province.

Abaqa Han and the end of the Pervane, 1265–82

In so far as he strove to maintain the style and even substance of Seljuk rule, the Pervane can be said to have continued to represent the Seljuks while dominating the new puppet sultan, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III. The early years of his government seem to have been peaceful: that is, if no news is good news.

tr. P. M. Holt (London and New York, 1992), pp. 126–7. For the different readings of these events by the chroniclers, see Ch. Melville, 'The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia', in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, ed. Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn (Wiesbaden, 2006), pp. 159–60.

⁴² Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 583–4 (Houtsma, pp. 263–4); Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 229.

⁴³ Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 76; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, I, p. 162; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 66, 71–2; Cl. Cahen, 'Notes pour l'histoire des Turcomans d'Asie Mineure au XIIIe siècle', *Journal Asiatique* 239 (1951), 336–8, 343–4; Smbat, *La chronique attribuée au Connétable Smbat*, tr. G. Dédéyan (Paris, 1980), pp. 108–10.

Ostensibly nothing had changed, though Aqsara'i records the introduction of a new allocation of the taxes of Rum into four categories – *yavit* (?yunit, horses), *na'lbaha* (army expenses), *mal-i yam* (courier service) and *mal-i buzurg* (central treasury) – which suggests a reorganisation of the finances of the province, increasingly geared towards the needs of the Mongol forces. The first decade of the child sultan's rule saw a great continuity in the main offices of state. The Pervane, of course, held the reins of power and Fahreddin Ali retained the *vezirate*. Taceddin Mutez continued to represent the interests of the *ordu*.⁴⁴

These men dominate political life for some time to come. They are all found together in a cameo scene in Celaleddin Rumi's *medrese* (school) in Konya, where they are given a virtuoso performance. While eager to court Rumi's blessing, however, they were less enthusiastic about his followers, whom only Rumi himself could keep under control.⁴⁵

It is in this period that there occurred the late cultural florescence within the Seljuk sultanate, under the Pervane's auspices. Many of these officials, like those of the previous generation, such as Kadı İzzeddin and Celaleddin Karatay, undertook pious works in and around Konya and elsewhere: among them, the Atabekiyye of Arslan Doğmuş, the Pervane's *medrese* in Kayseri, his *hanekah* (dervish lodge) in Tokat and his *han* (caravansary) on the route to Sivas, and the *medrese* built by Taceddin Mutez in Aksaray, together with his *hanekahs*, hospitals and *ribats* (fortified posts, caravansaries) throughout Anatolia.⁴⁶ This swansong of the Seljuks was also the last phase of the pre-eminence of Konya. Although it was still the seat of the Seljuk state and of the *naibüs-saltana*, Eminüddin Mikail, the centre of gravity was already moving further east, to Kayseri and the pasturelands located between these cities. The Pervane's own association with Tokat and the former Danişmend territory, nearer to the Mongol court, also necessarily reduced Konya to something of a backwater, a trend emphasised first by the development of Sivas and later by the threat of the Turkomans. The building work of Fahreddin Ali neatly encapsulates this process, as his pious foundations move progressively eastwards, from his *han* at İshaklı (1249), to *medreses* at Akşehir (1250), Konya (mosque, 1258), Kayseri (1267) and Sivas (1271). With the passing of this generation, architectural patronage

44 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 89. 45 Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, I, pp. 133–4, 129–30.

46 Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, I, pp. 184, 239, 305, 310, 348, 400, 444, II, p. 811; for the *hans*, see K. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansary des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1961); A. Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1931, 1934); J. M. Rogers, 'Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia: the Epigraphic Evidence', *Anatolian Studies* 26 (1976), 69–103; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 337; cf. R. Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 206–14, 346–50.

greatly declined, their successors having neither the prestige nor the resources to commission work on such a scale.⁴⁷

Eflaki's hagiography, and Celaleddin's work itself, is rich in allusions to the religious situation in Anatolia at this period, with its references to Christians, dervishes of various hues, and to the Mongols' own attitudes to Islam. One incident, involving the murder of a Mongol soldier, which led to the flight of Hüsameddin Bicar, the *subaşı* (commander, government agent) of Harput, and his son Bahadır to Mamluk territory in the summer of 1276, suggests that Islam was slow to make progress among the Mongol troops enduring the hardships of military service, camped away from the main centres of population.⁴⁸

Hüsameddin Bicar was also allegedly involved in the murder near Erzincan in 1276 of the Armenian bishop, Mar Sarkis, who was apparently inciting Abaqa against the Muslims. The Ilkhans' Muslim subjects still suffered real or imagined dangers, whether from the hostility of the Mongols themselves or from the machinations of the newly confident Christians. The Pervane was implicated in both murders, possibly already anticipating Sultan Baibars's future protection.⁴⁹

The later careers of Bicar and Bahadır were typical of many émigrés to Egypt: they were well received and became part of the Mamluk establishment, before dying within a year of each other, in 1281–2.⁵⁰ They were part of a stream of refugees from Ilkhanid territory at this time, due to the rapid escalation of the conflict that had been initiated by Hülegü.

Simmering hostility to Mongol rule, combined with the attraction of the impressive state-building achievements of the Mamluk sultan Baibars, generated a crisis that darkened the seemingly rosy Seljuk sunset. It is unclear whether increasing Mongol interference in Anatolia was the cause or the result of Baibars's invasions. The Pervane is usually blamed for the Mamluk intervention, but hostility to the Mongols was certainly widespread among the leading officials of the rump Seljuk government and it is not certain whether the Pervane was orchestrating or merely responding to this sentiment, which he was unable anyway to control. Another view might be that the Pervane's

47 B. Brend, 'The Patronage of Fahr ad-Din 'Ali ibn al-Husain and the Work of Kaluk ibn 'Abd Allah in the Development of the Decoration of Portals in Thirteenth-Century Anatolia', *Kunst des Orients* 10, 1–2 (1975), esp. 180; J. M. Rogers, 'Recent Work on Seljuk Anatolia', *Kunst des Orients* 6, 2 (1969), 148.

48 Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 153, 155; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 152–3; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, III, pp. 164–5; cf. R. Amitai, 'The Conversion of Tegtüder Ilkhan to Islam', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 25 (2001), 41–2; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 260.

49 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, pp. 455–6; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, p. 169 (February 1277, *sic*); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 100.

50 Al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, IV, pp. 107, 168.

fall was one of the objectives of the various conspirators, among whom there was otherwise little unity of purpose.

Baibars, too, had his own ambitions, and a desire for security on his northern borders; his belligerence also enhanced his image as protector of Islam against the pagan Mongols. The upshot was the only significant confrontation between the two powers on Anatolian soil, at the battle of Elbistan on 16 April 1277.

This produced an upheaval in the internal affairs of Rum, and a permanent extension of Ilkhanid administration into the province, not least to secure their control over a regime that could not be relied upon for loyal resistance to the Ilkhan's enemies. The ability of the Mamluks to project their power into the heart of Anatolia established a precedent and a warning; it also encouraged the view of the Mamluk sultanate as a source of support for Anatolian dissidents. Mamluk interests in the region endured and indeed expanded until the eve of the Ottoman conquests in the sixteenth century. Remarkably, however, the Seljuk sultanate itself continued to survive under Ilkhanid protection. Perhaps the Mongols realised that it served a purpose as a focus for local loyalties. In view of the persistent divisions within the Seljuk house, support for different members of the family remained a useful device for ensuring that such local loyalties did not again become strong enough to threaten Mongol rule.

The build-up to Baibars's invasion is described in great detail in the Mamluk chronicles,⁵¹ which are also valuable for the light they shed on the internal affairs of Rum. By at least 1268, the Mongol command seems to have devolved on to Samağar Noyan, in conjunction with Ejei (Ajai), Abaqa's brother and the first of many Chinggisid princes to form a close association with the province. As noted earlier, Ejei brought 3,000 troops with him in 1271 for a raid on northern Syria.⁵²

Shortly after this action, Samağar and the Pervane entered into diplomatic contact with Baibars, a correspondence that rapidly developed into a treacherous collusion between the Pervane and the Mamluk sultan. In the course of this, the Pervane made frequent visits to Abaqa's *ordu*, where he schemed against Ejei, whom he saw as a threat to his own independence of action. Ejei was eventually recalled and some of his supporters executed, in September 1275,⁵³ though he himself survived into the reign of Arghun. His descendants reappear in Anatolian affairs, as we shall see.

51 Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, pp. 157–78.

52 Al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, II, pp. 388, 411, 457. For Ejei, see also Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 967, 1051 (death of his mother). For the raid, Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir, *al-Rawd al-zahir*, pp. 395–6; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 133; Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, pp. 125–6.

53 Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 78, 107, 122–4; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, III, pp. 33–4, 113–14.

Samağar Noyan too was replaced by a new commander, Tuqu son of Ilge Noyan, the Celayir, as is witnessed by his signature in 1274 on an annex to the *vakıf* document of Nureddin b. Caca at Akşehir, previously guaranteed by Samağar in 1272. Tuqu's appointment did not remove the pressure of Mongol demands on the Pervane, for he had instructions to review the taxes in the province, and as a result of a tour of the region, he forwarded large sums back to the central treasury.⁵⁴

Tuqu was instrumental in the restoration to favour of Fahreddin Ali, who had been dismissed from the *vezirate* after the start of the Pervane's reign. His offence was to have responded sympathetically to correspondence from his former master, Sultan İzzeddin, now in uncomfortable exile in Crimea. Since there was little (at least in the sympathetic account of Ibn Bibi) to suggest that the correspondence was treasonable, this was evidently a pretext. The family of Ibn Hatir were particularly prominent in the manoeuvring against him, but whether this implies the formation of pro- and anti-Mamluk factions, rather than simple internal jealousies, is not clear. Fahreddin slowly resumed some of his functions before going to the *ordu* to seek reinstatement. This was granted, and his sons returned to their commands in Ladik, Khunas and Develikarahisar on payment of substantial annual tribute, including 2,000 *balish* (ingots of silver) and 700 horses.⁵⁵

In June 1276, the Pervane and Fahreddin accompanied Sultan Gıyaseddin's sister, Selçuk Hatun, to the *ordu* as a bride for Abaqa. It is not certain that he married her, but she is named as one of the wives of Arghun, who evidently inherited her from his father. Whether or not this was at Abaqa's instigation, it was consistent with the Ilkhanid policy of forming marriage ties with the provincial rulers in their Iranian territories.⁵⁶

Two months later, the Pervane returned from the *ordu* with a large force under the command of Toda'un, the grandfather of Emir Çoban, who later played an important role in Anatolia. The army sent by Abaqa seems also to have been accompanied, at least initially, by one of his younger brothers. This

54 Rogers, 'Recent Work', pp. 145–6; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, p. 108.

55 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 652–6, 657 (Houtsma, pp. 304–7, 308 (no dates)); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 92–5 (1272–4); Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 62–3, 122–3; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, III, pp. 7, 112–13 (1273–5). Apparently, Afyon Karahisar is meant, cf. 'Afyun Kara Hisar' and 'Kara Hisar' in *El2*, I, pp. 243–3, IV, pp. 578–80 (Mordtmann).

56 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 661–2 (Houtsma, p. 310); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 100; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 153–4; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 147; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, III, p. 165; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1152; cf. Lambton, *Continuity and Change*, pp. 271–88.

force had first to deal with the revolt of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, the *beylerbeyi*, who either on his own initiative or with the Pervane's approval, colluded openly with the Mamluks while the Pervane was at court. Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu had taken the young sultan to his *ikta* at Niğde and despatched his brother Ziyaüddin Mahmud Hatiroğlu to get help from Baibars, accompanied by relatives of most of the leading Seljuk officials, who were thus constrained to do as Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu wished. These 'defectors' arrived in Syria in July 1276; when news arrived in October of the execution of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, Baibars detained the hostages, who were not released until after his death. After the defeat and trial of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, the Mongols retired to their winter quarters at Delice and Kırşehir.⁵⁷

The following spring, 1277, they congregated at Kayseri before moving to meet the Mamluk advance on Elbistan. Qutu, the grandson of Baiju, who had wintered near Niğde, failed to appear, suggesting a continuing disaffection with the Ilkhanid regime among the former partisans of the Golden Horde. The ensuing battle, in which the Seljuk forces played only a limited role, proved to be a triumph of Mamluk military training and organisation and the Mongols were routed, leaving Baibars's way to Kayseri open. Having sat on the Seljuk throne and been acknowledged on the coinage and in the Friday sermon on 22 April 1277, Baibars headed for home. He was disappointed in the Pervane's failure to live up to his promises and anxious to avoid being caught by a larger Mongol force under Abaqa himself, which had set off immediately on news of the defeat. Baibars took with him numerous defectors from Seljuk Rum, who were no doubt well aware that troubled times lay ahead. Very few Mongols were reported as captured; most, including the commanders, Tuqu, Uruqtu and Toda'un, were killed.⁵⁸

Defeat by the Mamluks and the repeated failure of the Ilkhans to avenge this and other humiliations must have undermined their authority in Anatolia and had negative effects on their rule in the province, such as distrust of the local officials and the need to recoup their military losses by financial extortion. Nevertheless, it was the Turkomans who posed the greatest threat to the stability of Mongol rule, not the supporters of the old regime.

57 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 666–9 (Houtsma, pp. 314–16); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 103–6, 108; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 102; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 161–2, 163–5; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 147–8; al-Yunini, *Dhayl*, III, p. 170.

58 Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 173–5, 337; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 155; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 670–8 (in verse) (Houtsma, pp. 316–18); Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1101.

Even before the Mamluk intervention, Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu had encouraged the Karamanids to assert their independence; attempts to subdue them had to be postponed until after Baibars's withdrawal. Seeing Konya almost abandoned by the leading officials, to meet the Mamluk threat, the Turkomans seized their chance. A young man nicknamed Cimri, claiming to be a son (which one, varies) of the former sultan İzzeddin Keykavus, was brought to the attention of the Karamanid chief, Mehmed Bey. Thus armed with a spurious legitimacy, the Karamanids marched on Konya, took control of the city and killed the *naibüs-saltana*, Eminüddin Mikail (May 1277). Cimri was sworn in as sultan and the famous order was given that government decrees should only be in Turkish. Mehmed Bey was made *vezir* and the Turkoman chiefs all given appointments. The citadel, which had held out, was won over by '40,000 oaths'. Mehmed Bey sought the hand of Rükneddin's daughter for his protégé.⁵⁹

Abaqa's rapid arrival on the scene after the defeat at Elbistan revealed his determination to reassert his authority. Both the sultan and Fahreddin Ali hastened to pay their homage, as did the Pervane. The latter's actions, however, had made his fate inevitable; the question of his role in the murder of Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan was also brought up against him. Nevertheless, his execution in Aladağ in September 1277 left a void in the government of Rum, a void that entailed a closer Mongol supervision of the province.

On his withdrawal, Abaqa appointed his brother Kongurtay to overall command; his first task was to restore order 'up to the shore of the western sea'. As Kongurtay advanced, Cimri fled to the western *uc*, whereupon the Mongols harried the Karamanids in the region round Larendé (Karaman) and Ermenek and ultimately killed Mehmed Bey, his brothers and cousin, in October 1277. The troops then retired to winter quarters in Kazova near Tokat.

The following spring, 1278, Fahreddin Ali, anxious to regain his territorial possessions without the inevitable damage that would have been caused by the Mongol forces, secured Kongurtay's permission to act on his own. Together with the Seljuk sultan, he attacked Cimri near his base at Karahisar. Ibn Bibi reports the dubious loyalty of the Seljuk troops, and observes that the Turks of the Germiyan beylik of western Anatolia, despite their superficial appearance of loyalty to the Mongol regime, never acted to honour their agreements. Nevertheless, on this occasion they supported the operations and captured

59 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 690–7 (Houtsma, pp. 323–6); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 123–4; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 104; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 179–81; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 267–8.

Cimri, who was flayed alive (10 June 1278). As a result, the Turkomans were pacified.⁶⁰

Events were soon to show that this effort of suppression was only partly successful. From this time on, the Turkomans were a permanent threat to Mongol rule and encroached on the territories under central control.⁶¹

Tuqu and Toda'un, killed at the battle of Elbistan, were replaced with Kuhurgai and the former commander, Samağar Noyan, who provided an element of continuity in the Mongols' military presence in Rum. He is mentioned as a representative (*naib*) of the regime and commander of a *tuman* until the reign of Arghun; as in other such cases, his descendants maintained an enduring association with the province. However, it was Kuhurgai who was more active in the new arrangements.⁶²

Alongside the military measures taken to restore order, Abaqa despatched his chief minister, the *sahib-i divan*, Şemseddin Cüveyni (Juvaini) to regulate the affairs of Rum. At winter quarters in Kazova in 1277–8, while actions were continuing against the Turkomans, Cüveyni sent despatches round the disturbed areas such as Kastamonu, Sinop and the *uc*, eradicating irregularities, setting reasonable tax assessments and restoring confidence. As the repayments on the debts incurred by Baba Tuğrai, as well as the capital sums and interest demanded by the Mongol *ortaqs* (commercial partnerships) from the agents of the *Divan* had become excessive and unpayable, Cüveyni removed this burden from the Seljuk sultanate's finances and instead added Erzincan and its dependencies to the other *injü* (crown) lands directly under Mongol administration, in a legal (*şer'i*) transfer. Cüveyni also introduced the characteristic Mongol commercial tax, the *tamgha*, into the province.⁶³ These moves taken together show a desire for greater incorporation of Anatolia into the Ilkhanid fiscal regime, accompanied by a reduction in the responsibilities and scope of the local Seljuk administration.

Cüveyni had already become involved in Rum in 1272, founding the Çifte Minare Medresesi in Sivas. The inscriptions, which mention neither Abaqa

60 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 679–84 (Houtsma, pp. 319–20), 698–701, 703–5, 721–2, 725–9 (Houtsma, pp. 327–33); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 129–32; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 106; Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 181–4; cf. Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 271–3.

61 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 133.

62 Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 169, 185, 239 (Samağar); Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1061, 1104; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 703, 723 (Houtsma, pp. 330, 331 (Kuhurgai)).

63 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 701–3, 705, 721–2 (Houtsma, pp. 329–31); Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1104.

nor the Seljuk sultan, betray Cüveyni's private initiative and probably private interest alert to the need to develop this important nodal point in the regional trade network.⁶⁴

All power of decision now lay with the *ordu*, as did the appointment of officials. In 1280, Mücireddin Muhammad arrived from court to administer the Mongol *injü* (crown) lands and tax farms of the province (*mukataat-i amval-i mamalik*) on behalf of the central *Divan*. He took this office over from his father, Taceddin Mutez, who had died in 1274, along with many others of the old guard.⁶⁵ A new era was beginning, and one in which the affairs of Rum would soon be caught up in the turmoil at the heart of the Ilkhanate. The Seljuk sultanate was again affected by these divisions. The loyalist tinge of Cimri's 'revolt', however opportunistic, showed that the Seljuk name could still attract a following. The Mongols could try to harness this sentiment as well as the Turkomans.

The relative success of the pretender Cimri may have encouraged an attempt by a genuine claimant, whom Ibn Bibi calls the 'heir apparent' (*vali 'ahd*). Sultan İzzeddin, who had fled to Byzantium in 1261, was rescued from incarceration by Batu Han's grandson, Möngke Temür, who welcomed him and gave him Urbai Hatun, a daughter of Berke Han, in marriage. He then enjoyed a cheerless exile in Crimea. This suggests the Golden Horde had not entirely abandoned its interest in Anatolian affairs. In 1280, on his deathbed, İzzeddin encouraged his oldest son, Mesud, to take up his inheritance, but Mesud was not so keen to take on his father's widow, Urbai Hatun. His desire to escape from her is light-heartedly given as one of his motives for leaving for Sinop, though she seems to have caught up with him later.

Learning from the experience of his middle brother, Rükneddin Geyumers (or Melik Siyavuş), who had slipped off to Anatolia before him and was later to cause many disturbances, Mesud presented himself directly to Samağar Noyan, who sent him to the Ilkhan. He was welcomed by Abaqa and granted an income drawn on Amid (Diyarbakır), Harput, Malatya and Sivas, while apparently remaining in Erzincan. Following news of the Mongols' defeat by the Mamluks at Homs (October 1281), Mesud's nephew, Alaeddin son of Feramurz, arrived in Karamanid territory, where he was taken by the Turkomans to Larende and

64 Brend, 'The patronage of Fahr ad-Din', p. 179; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1111–12.

65 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 117–18, 134; Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 730–1 (Houtsma, p. 334); Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 274; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, 1, pp. 107–9.

proclaimed ruler. Loyalist forces from Niğde, however, caused him to flee to Cilicia. He did not re-emerge till later (see below).⁶⁶

Sultan Gıyaseddin was meanwhile in Erzurum when news arrived of further Karamanid and Eşrefoğlu (another Turkish beylik) rampages round Konya and Akşehir. He marched against the rebels and was reinforced by Mongol forces under Kongurtay. The Karamanids were defeated and pursued to the area of Ermenek and Mut, where they were attacked and besieged, until Kongurtay was recalled to Kayseri, leaving the work of subduing the Turkomans once more unfinished.⁶⁷ His brutal activities were a source of concern for the Mamluks, as raised in Sultan Qalawun's response to the Mongol embassy of September 1282, led by Kutbüddin Şirazi (*kadı* of Sivas) and other Rumi officials.⁶⁸

It is likely that Kongurtay had previously left the province on the news of the death of his brother Abaqa (31 March 1282). The disputed accession of another brother, Ahmad Tegüder (1282–4), initiated a prolonged period of succession crises and rivalries at the centre of the Ilkhanid state. These were reflected in the provinces and particularly in Anatolia, which became to Tabriz what Syria was to Cairo: an excellent base from which to bid for independence.

Dissension within the Ilkhanate, 1282–94

Mesud son of İzzeddin spent some time at the *ordu*, until Ahmad decided on a new division of the sultanate, as in the days of Hülegü. Rum was assigned to the incumbent sultan, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III, and the coast (*vilayat-i Qamar al-Din*, that is, the Karamanid region in the south) to the newcomer, Mesud.⁶⁹ The latter was welcomed in Erzincan by Mücireddin Tahir, who not only received confirmation of his father's former office as Mongol agent in the province, but was also appointed Mesud's *naibüs-saltana*. The veteran

66 Ibn Bibi, *Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya*, pp. 735–6, 739–42 (Houtsma, pp. 334–7); cf. Ibn Bibi, *Akhbar-i Salajiqā-yi Rum*, ed. M. J. Mashkur (Tehran, 1350/1971), p. 337 (Rükneddin Geyumers); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 106–7 (Siyavuş); Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 93–4, 126, 168–9 (Mesud with two sons [*sic*], Melik and Qaramard [= Feramurz]); al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat*, xxvii, pp. 110–11; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 134; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, p. 462 (Mesud only); Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 276–7. Ibn Bibi concludes his chronicle with Mesud's return, see Melville, 'Persian Historiography', p. 157.

67 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 108 (in the reign of Ahmad).

68 See e.g. Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 226; Ibn al-'Ibri, *Ta'rikh mukhtasar al-duwal*, p. 296; Adel Allouche, 'Tegüder's Ultimatum to Qalawun', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 22 (1990), 441–2.

69 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 137–8; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 107.

Fahreddin Ali retained the *vezirate*. These two worked for the sole sultanate of Mesud, who was elevated to the throne for the first time on 20 June 1283.⁷⁰ In Rum as elsewhere, it was now becoming desirable to try to foster unity rather than division in the provinces, lest one party turn to a rival loyalty for Ahmad's nephew, Arghun.

This is exactly what happened in Anatolia. It was perhaps to restore his waning influence, or because he had little choice in the matter, that Giyaseddin became embroiled in Kongurtay's challenge to Ahmad. Together with Arap son of Samağar, Kongurtay had supported his brother's election at Maragha and shortly afterwards, in July 1282, he was sent back to Anatolia with a large army, which carried out the brutal expedition against the Karamanids already noted. But the following summer, Kongurtay, either pursuing his own ambitions or supporting the cause of Arghun, made a bid for power in association with the Seljuk sultan. Summoned by Ahmad Tegüder, apparently in response to Mamluk complaints about his actions, he left Giyaseddin at Erzurum on his way east. When he reached the *ordu*, however, Kongurtay was betrayed and killed, on the Mongol New Year's day, 18 January 1284. A month later, Giyaseddin also died, or was eliminated, in Erzincan.⁷¹

The upheavals in Anatolia found similar expression in other provinces of the Ilkhanate. Once Arghun had overcome his uncle (August 1284), there was a return to the policy of divide and rule, as in Kirman.⁷² The marriage connections of the Ilkhans with the provincial rulers were a complicating element in the formation of local interests and factions.

In Anatolia too, women played a role in political intrigue. Under Arghun, the mother of the dead Giyaseddin Keyhüsrev asserted the claim of his two young sons and another division of the kingdom was agreed: they were installed on the throne in Konya on 17 November 1284 and again, with the backing of the Karaman and Eşrefoğlu Turkomans, on 4 May 1285.⁷³ With this division,

70 Ahmed of Niğde, *al-Walad al-shafiq*, Istanbul: Süleymaniye, Fatih, Ms. 4518, f. 150v (Kayseri); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 108 (Konya). For Ahmed of Niğde's history, see A. C. S. Peacock, 'Ahmad of Niğde's *al-Walad al-Shafiq* and the Seljuk Past', *Anatolian Studies* 54 (2004), 95–107.

71 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1125–7, 1129, 1133–4; Vassaf Shirazi, *Tajziyat al-amsar wa tazjiyat al-a'sar*, ed. M. M. Isfahani, lith. (Bombay, 1269/1853), p. 125; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 139; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 109; Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 479; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 238–9; J. Pfeiffer, 'Ahmad Tegüder's Second Letter to Qala'un (682/1283)', in Pfeiffer and Quinn, *History and Historiography*, pp. 180–2.

72 J. Aubin, *Émirs mongols et vizirs persans dans les remous de l'acculturation* (Paris, 1995), pp. 34–5, 39; cf. above, note 38, and G. Lane, *Early Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Iran: a Persian Renaissance* (London, 2003), p. 117.

73 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 109–10; İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Ashraf Oghullari', *Eİİ*, 1, p. 703.

the old associations were reversed: the descendants of Rükneddin were now established in the west, while the heirs of İzzeddin (represented by Mesud) were in the east.

The division lasted only a few months, however, as Mesud's supporters, assisted in turn by his mother, were able to gain Arghun's agreement to his restoration as sole sultan. His young rivals, who had presided over a period of extortion in Konya, were eliminated. Mesud was enthroned in Konya for a second time on 2 June 1286. He was sultan only in name: all power remained in the hands of the Mongols' agents (*shihna*).⁷⁴

On his accession, Arghun had sent his brother Geyhatu and uncle Hülegü as governors in Rum, based in Erzincan, where Fahreddin Ali was responsible for their provisioning (*taghar*). He was held personally liable for a shortfall in the needs of the army. The Mongols' exactions, which depleted all the wealth he had acquired over fifty years, made him weary of life. In fact, Fahreddin did not long survive; he died in Akşehir and his body was taken to Konya for burial on 22 November 1288.⁷⁵ Mücireddin had meanwhile gone to the *ordu*, where he secured the emirate (*imarat*) of Rum for himself and the *vezirate* for Fahreddin Kazvini, who had briefly been *vezir* in the new central government of Emir Buka. Aqsara'i paints a shocking picture of Kazvini's incompetence and greed: he allegedly did not even know what the *cizye* (poll-tax on non-Muslims) was. Among the accusations against him is the endless refrain that he brought into the province whole trains of foreigners.⁷⁶

The new *vezir*'s credentials indicated that he held the province of Rum as *qabala*, that is, as a tax farm, a sure recipe for over-exploitation of the sort already initiated in Fars. With the approval of the Mongol emirs, Mücireddin proposed an administrative division of Anatolia, so that each might be answerable for whatever prosperity or damage was caused. Mücireddin chose the former Danişmend territory, from Sivas and Tokat to Kastamonu and the coast up to Samsun and Sinop, while Kazvini received the original share of Sultan İzzeddin, now defined as running from Kayseri to the edge of the *uc*. Both men were accompanied by Mongol emirs, respectively Duladay Yarghuchi (interrogating

74 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 111–12; Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 279; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 239.

75 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1155; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 145–6, 149–50 (and n. 5); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 112, 115. The date is uncertain, see A. S. Erzi, 'Ibn Bibi', in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. v / 2, p. 715a; Ibn Bibi, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi*, ed. H. W. Duda (Copenhagen, 1959), p. 10.

76 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 149, 152–3. Contrast the view of Kazvini's cousin, Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 479.

officer) and Ejei Tutaqa'ul (road guardian), a partnership typical of Mongol dual administration since the earliest conquests.⁷⁷

Not surprisingly, the contrast between the two administrations quickly became clear. Kazvini faced considerable difficulties in the turbulent south-western regions, where the involvement of the Karamanids and Eşrefoğlu in the ambitions of the mother of Sultan Gıyaseddin, noted earlier, created a breakdown of control from the outset of Arghun's reign. This was compounded by the corruption of local officials in Konya. Almost immediately, Mesud had to face a revolt of the Germiyan, until this point more or less docile. In a prolonged series of campaigns in 1286–7, the government suffered several reverses. Mongol forces were led at first by Baltu son of Nabşı, and a joint Seljuk–Mongol army was later led by the elderly Fahreddin Ali, in the last year of his life. Following inconclusive reprisals against the Germiyan, Mesud and the *vezir* were instructed by Arghun to attack the Karamanids, while the Eşrefoğlu tried to take advantage of the momentary discomfort of the Germiyan. Eventually, in July 1288, peace was restored with all three groups.

As the Turkoman uprisings continued, it is not surprising that Kazvini's administration, whether incompetent or otherwise, struggled to regulate a region that was barely under military control. The Karamanids eventually once more offered homage to Sultan Mesud and the *vezir* at Konya on 16 May 1290, while not failing to impress upon Kazvini the size of their forces. The previous year, the *beylerbeyi* Azizeddin defeated the Germiyan and killed their leader, Bedreddin Murad, near Denizli (Ladik).⁷⁸

After the recall of his uncle Hülegü in 1286, Geyhatu had remained in Anatolia, advancing through Sivas and Kayseri to Aksaray, to the consternation of the populace. However, this time, his army of 20,000 troops was well behaved and provisioning them became a source of profit for the local economy (and tax returns). Presumably at around this date, his wife, Padşah Hatun, carried out some work at the Çifte Minare Medresesi in Erzurum, if indeed she was involved in it at all.⁷⁹

Geyhatu's presence supported the efforts of the Mongol tax officials to restore Konya's revenues. Kazvini's days were numbered, however, and various portents heralded his fall, not least an ominous encounter with Sultan Veled, the son of Celaleddin Rumi. Soon afterwards, Samağar, still the senior Mongol

77 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 115; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 153–4.

78 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 112–18; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 280–3.

79 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 146–7; J. M. Rogers, 'The Date of the Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzerum', *Kunst des Orients* 8, 1–2 (1972), esp. 92–7.

emir in Geyhatu's entourage, received orders to bring Kazvini to Sivas for investigation. Found guilty, he was sent to the *ordu* at Aladağ together with Mücireddin, who was spared on the intervention of Şeyh Kutbüddin of Konya. Fahreddin Kazvini, however, was executed on 2 September 1290, thanks not least to a certain Şemseddin of Konya rehearsing all his 'innovations'. Among these was an attempt to manipulate the price of salt and sheep.⁸⁰ Mücireddin's Mongol associate, Duladay the *yarghuchi*, reached the *ordu* a month later, together with the Celayirid emir, Akbuğa, who was then sent back to Rum.

Kazvini's demise coincided with the rise to power at court of the Jewish *vezir*, Sa'd al-Daula,⁸¹ who had replaced the Mongol Buka in June 1289. He sent Şemseddin Ahmed Lakuşi and the sons of Kilavuz to replace Kazvini and Mücireddin. Samağar seems to have been anxious to spare the populace from the even worse depredations of the sons of Kilavuz. Now with the title of *yarghuchi*, Samağar's just and benevolent regime was extremely popular in Konya, at least; Arghun briefly made him and Sultan Mesud his representatives (*vilayat*) in Anatolia, evidence of the greatly reduced status of the sultanate. Arghun also sent the resourceful Urbai Hatun to Konya as a wife for Mesud, who was enthroned a third time on 2 October 1290.⁸² A new dispensation was announced, presumably confirming the *vezirate* of Lakuşi and the Kilavuz regime.

Geyhatu was rather quickly ordered to send Samağar back to the *ordu* and to assume control of the province himself, now with the support of the Celayirid Akbuğa and the valued services of the *müstevisi* (*mustaufi*), Nasireddin Hoca, the son of Yavlak Arslan. Fahreddin Kazvini's attempted registration of private property, gardens, water sources and trade corporations in Konya, evidently for taxation purposes, which had previously caused such consternation, was now carried through under Nasireddin Hoca's reassuring auspices. On 29 November 1290, Geyhatu made a triumphal entry into Konya, where his regime appears to have been astonishingly benevolent, especially in contrast with his later actions. His respect for Muslim customs and concern for justice are depicted in an ideal portrait by the anonymous author, no doubt as a result of his patronage by Nasireddin Hoca.⁸³ Geyhatu's close identification with the province and his

80 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 118–19; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 158–62; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1178.

81 See esp. the bitter view of Mustaufi, *Guzida*, pp. 598–9.

82 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 156–7 (Sa'd al-Daula), 159–60 (Samağar); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 119–20; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, pp. 168–9 (Urbai Hatun's career on reaching Rum); Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 284.

83 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 120–2; Melville, 'Persian Historiography', pp. 153–4.

preference for remaining there was a major factor in the instability of his brief reign when he succeeded to the Ilkhanate.

Arghun died on 9 March 1291 and an envoy was quickly sent to Rum to summon Geyhatu from his winter quarters there. However, several emirs, including the veteran Samağar and the rising star, Taghachar, had second thoughts and began to favour Arghun and Geyhatu's cousin, Baidu. Forewarned, however, Geyhatu moved rapidly east. Support for the reluctant Baidu fell away and Geyhatu was elevated to the throne near Ahlat on 22 July.⁸⁴

Taghachar's fears that Geyhatu's election as Han would favour the Anatolians with whom he had associated during his governorship of the province were soon proved correct. Taghachar himself was disciplined and his *tuman* was given to Ejei Tutaqa'ul, the former associate of Fahreddin Kazvini.⁸⁵ The Celayirid family of Ilge Noyan were also favoured: Geyhatu's chief wife was Ayşe Hatun, daughter of Tuqu who was killed at the battle of Elbistan in 1277. Next was Dundi Hatun, daughter of Akbuğa, Tuqu's younger brother. Two of Tuqu's sons would soon receive important positions in Anatolia.

By the end of August, Geyhatu was ready to return to Rum, on reports of Turkoman uprisings and a situation that had deteriorated rapidly in his absence. He had left a certain Fahreddin Mesud in charge overall, with a different governor in each town. The sultan was in Kayseri; his brother Melik Siyavuş was persuaded by his entourage to take control of Konya. It was an ideal opportunity for the Turkomans once more to pursue their own rivalries and independence. Preoccupied elsewhere, Sultan Mesud was unable to prevent the Turkoman chief Halil Bahadır from sacking Konya.⁸⁶ After a number of further engagements, forces commanded by Melik and by Fahreddin Ali's grandson made the fatal error of pursuing the Karamanids to Larendé, where they were defeated. The sultan appealed to Geyhatu, and when news of his arrival in Kayseri reached Konya, at the end of October 1291, there was rejoicing.⁸⁷ However, the clemency of his earlier governorship was now transformed into the most vicious brutality.

Dividing the army into two, Geyhatu sent one half to Akşehir and himself attacked Karamanid territory, laying waste Ereğli and Larendé and killing all in his path, before moving against the Eşrefoğlu. He then assaulted Denizli

84 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1183–4; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, pp. 259–60; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 168–9; Ch. Melville, 'The Chinese Uighur Animal Calendar in Persian Historiography of the Mongol Period', *Iran* 32 (1994), 91 (date).

85 Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 260.

86 Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 288, considers him a Germiyan chief; F. Sümer, 'Karāmān-oghulları', *El2*, iv, p. 621, makes him a Karamanid.

87 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 170; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 124–7.

(Ladik) and moved on the Menteşe. By the end of the year (December 1291) strings of captives were entering Konya and a reign of terror began; the eighteen days the Mongols were camped outside the city seemed longer than eighteen years. Geyhatu spared Konya itself, however, perhaps as the result of seeing Celaeddin Rumi in a dream. During this short period, two further assaults were carried out against the Karamanids, before Geyhatu left for Kayseri.⁸⁸

Geyhatu's absence in Rum was causing disquiet at the *ordu*, as the chiefs wondered how he could exert effective control while residing at a distance of two months' journey away from court. Rumours of his defeat and death at the hands of the Karamanids were circulated by Taghachar and Sadreddin Zanjani, with a view to installing an alternative, Prince Anbarji son of Möngke Temür, but the truth of Geyhatu's successes and welfare was confirmed before the prince could be implicated. In the spring of 1292, the returning Ilkhan was met at Erzurum by his loyal officers; on 29 June 1292, a second coronation was carried out at Aladağ, in accordance with Mongol custom, with the sanction of the Great Han, Qubilai. Shortly afterwards, news arrived of the Mamluk expedition against Qal'at al-Rum; the Mongol forces sent to relieve the fortress arrived too late and it passed into Mamluk hands. Geyhatu spent the summer in Aladağ and after recovering from a serious illness, went to Arran for the winter. Sadreddin Zanjani was forgiven and appointed *vezir*, with the support of the new senior emir, Akbuğa the Celayirid (18 November 1292).⁸⁹

Among his rivals for the post was Şemseddin Lakuşi, whose efforts in Rum had evidently led to his dismissal, probably at the same time that Samağar was recalled to the *ordu*. The main plank of his policies was the sale of *divani* (state) lands to the ownership of the administrators themselves, in the belief that the estates would be better run in private hands and generate more tax revenue than under state mismanagement. This was merely part of a long-term process of the transfer of land into private ownership.⁹⁰

The pointlessness of Geyhatu's violence in Rum was quickly revealed, as the Turkomans resumed their raiding as soon as he had left the province. The Eşrefoğlu briefly held Kavala (Gevele, north-west of Konya), 'the key to Anatolia'; the Karamanids seized Alanya ('Ala'iyya) and read the *hutbe* (Friday sermon) there in the name of the Mamluk sultan, al-Ashraf Khalil.⁹¹

88 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 127–8; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, pp. 491–2; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, I, pp. 331–3, II, pp. 611–13; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 286–8.

89 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1193–5; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, pp. 261–2, 264; Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 288–9.

90 Mustaufi, *Guzida*, pp. 479–80 (Fakhr al-Din Ahmad Lakushi); Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 310.

91 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 128–9 (Kavala); al-Jazari, *Hawadith al-zaman*, tr. J. Sauvaget as *La chronique de Damas d'al-Jazari (Années 689–698 H)* (Paris, 1949), p. 29 (for *hutbe*).

The rather ambiguous activities of Sultan Mesud's brother, variously referred to as Melik, Siyavuş and Rükneddin, eventually took the form of outright revolt, centred in Safranbolu (Burghlu). The emirs of Kastamonu took his part, and as a result Geyhatu despatched a joint force of Persian and Mongol forces to deal with the uprising. The Seljuk troops were led by Sultan Mesud and other senior government officials, who were fortunate to fight through to Osmancik, before returning in victory to the capital.⁹²

On leaving Anatolia after his whirlwind tour of destruction, Geyhatu had appointed the restored Mücireddin Tahir as his *naib*, Sahib Necmeddin as *vezir* and Taştımur Hatayi (Tashtemür Khita'i) as governor (*iyalat-i vilayat*). Their command was effective from Erzurum to the coast at Antalya, except that officials everywhere began to collect the taxes on their own behalf and regulate their own affairs, with numerous petitions to the *ordu*. Taştımur, like Fahreddin Kazvini before him, held Rum as a tax farm (*qabala*) and his arrival with legions of Khurasanis brought more stormy times for the long-suffering inhabitants of Konya, who endured the notorious *qubchur* (poll-tax) and other exactions until it became impossible to continue, and Taştımur was arrested.⁹³ However, he was still identified as governor (*hakim*) of Rum at the time of Sülemiş's revolt of 1298–9.

New appointments in 1293 do not seem to have improved the chaotic administration of the province, characteristic of Geyhatu's government in general. Two of Akbuğa's nephews, sons of Tuqu, received important positions in Rum: Hasan Bey was responsible for *dalay* (state) and Taiju for *injü* (crown) revenues, apparently under the continuing overall control of Mücireddin, to whom the revenues were actually paid. He became representative (*naib*) not only of the Seljuk sultan, Mesud, but also of the Ilkhan. This new organisation arrived in Anatolia with a full complement of hangers-on and redundant supporting functionaries.⁹⁴ As at the centre, the multiplication of officials and their alleged incompetence led to the formation of factions and the pursuit of private interests, spurred on by the insecurity of office.

At court, Sadreddin Zanjani was able to do much as he pleased, and was given a free rein to intervene in the provincial governorships. Among the measures he took was the dismissal of Hasan and Taiju from their supervision of the *injü* estates. As in Fars, he probably merged these crown revenues with state income (*dalay*), removing the distinction between them. When, in

92 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 170–9; contrast Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 129 and cf. Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 288–9.

93 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 179–80; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 129–30.

94 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 180–2; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 265.

October 1293, Hasan and Taiju attacked Sadreddin's misappropriation of state funds, Geyhatu gave his total support to the *vezir*.⁹⁵

The effects in Rum of this direction of affairs at the centre can only be imagined. The continuing insubordination of Sultan Mesud's brother Siyavuş did nothing to help the establishment of a stable administration, and drew Mongol forces into the province once more in support of the sultan. On the news of the approach of Baltu son of Nabşi, Siyavuş fled to Demirli Hisar, where Baltu, however, impressed by his youthful looks, gave him his daughter in marriage. Shortly afterwards, news arrived of Geyhatu's death at the hands of the partisans of Baidu, in March 1295. Hasan son of Tuqu went over to Baidu and as a result was later spared, but Akbuğa and Taiju were killed.⁹⁶ While Anatolia's importance remained undiminished, the affairs of the province would from now on stand in a different relationship with the central government.

Direct rule, 1295–1335

Baidu's reign was too brief for him to establish an administration in Anatolia. In local sources, it is depicted merely as a period of chaos and anti-Muslim oppression, to strengthen the contrast with the reign of Ghazan Han that followed.⁹⁷

Ghazan's victory over Baidu in 1295 is normally presented as a turning point in Ilkhanid government, ushering in a period of administrative reform, a revival of Islamic norms and the extension of central control over the empire. The events recorded in Anatolia, however, are, by and large, revolts against central authority, not just by the Turkomans, but by senior Mongol commanders, who saw the province as a place to make or restore their own fortunes. As Sümer correctly observes, Mongol dominion in Anatolia during the time of Ghazan Han was in its weakest phase.⁹⁸

Baidu sent Taghachar, who had already betrayed Geyhatu, together with the former *vezir*, Sadreddin Zanjani, to Rum, to get them out of the way. Pretending to head there, they had instead gone over to Ghazan. Once enthroned, Ghazan confirmed Taghachar as governor of Anatolia, also thinking it was best to have him far from court. He was despatched to his post in November 1295,

95 Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 268; Aubin, *Émirs mongols*, pp. 46, 48; cf. Lambton, *Continuity and Change*, p. 121. For Fars, D. Aigle, *Le Fars sous la domination mongole. Politique et fiscalité (XIIIe–XIVe s.)* (Paris, 2005), esp. pp. 141–6.

96 Anon, *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 131; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 184; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1201–2; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, pp. 277–82.

97 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 185–6.

98 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 190; Sümer, 'Karāmān-oghullari', p. 621a.

apparently without a supporting force. The nature of these appointments itself reveals a changed view of Anatolia as a distant province and even a place of exile, rather than a prestigious posting for senior members of the Ilkhan's family. However, as it was not securely controlled, this distance became a disadvantage, and Taghachar became the first of many Mongol commanders who sought to use Anatolia as a base for his own independence. Others, such as Ildar son of Ejei, saw it as a place of refuge. He fled to Rum with 300 men in January 1296 and finally went to ground in the Erzurum region before being caught and executed.⁹⁹

Meanwhile, Taghachar was thought to have been implicated in the rebellion of Prince Süge in western Iran, and once in Rum he started to make trouble on his own account. He installed himself in Tokat, where he quickly alienated the army commander, Arap son of Samağar. Arap, who is named as governor of Sivas at around this time, retired to his own summer pastures. Taghachar went to Delice, where he was besieged by Baltu son of Nabşı and was finally captured and handed over to Ghazan's agents.¹⁰⁰

No sooner was Taghachar removed than Baltu himself was tempted to rebel. His long association with the province made him the most senior commander there, especially after the death of the veteran Samağar, whose son Arap was still young. Baltu's defiance of Ghazan's repeated summonses was apparently encouraged by Ildei son of Kongurtay, who, however, was exposed and executed in September 1296: yet another Chinggisid prince to perish at the outset of Ghazan's reign.¹⁰¹

Two months later, Ghazan sent the new senior emir, Kutluşah, with three *tumans* to deal with Baltu. Following a bloody encounter with the local forces of Arap son of Samağar in the plain of Malya near Kırşehir, Baltu fled and laid an ambush for his pursuers, led by Abışga (destined to remain in Rum throughout Ghazan's reign). The next day, the main army, including forces under Arap and Sülemiş the grandson of Baiju, arrived and defeated Baltu, who fled to the *uc*. Many of his supporters trusted in Karamanid help to cross into Cilicia, but were massacred. Neither did Baltu obtain the help from the

99 Compare Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1256–7, 1261, 1262, with Mustaufi, *Zafar-nama*, London: British Museum, Ms. Or. 2388, f. 677r; facs. ed. Nasrollah Pourjavadi and Nosratollah Rastegar, 2 vols. (Tehran and Vienna, 1377/1999), p. 1355; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 327.

100 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 191–6; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, pp. 131–2; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1265; Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 603; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, pp. 855 (Sivas).

101 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1269–70 (reads Ildar); see J. A. Boyle, 'Dynastic and Political History of the Il-Khans', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. V, ed. J. A. Boyle (Cambridge, 1968), p. 381.

Turkomans that he had hoped for. After various indecisive engagements with Sülemiş, he also fled to Cilicia. However, he was handed over to the Mongols and at last executed in Tabriz (14 September 1297).¹⁰² He never had sufficient support to make a viable bid for independence.

Once more, as in the case of Gıyaseddin and Kongurtay earlier, the Seljuk sultan became embroiled in these events. Mesud appears to have lent himself willingly to Baltu's cause, perhaps in the hope of relaxing his subservience to the *ordu*. He had, in fact, been quite active since his installation by Arghun and retained at least nominal control of the Seljuk forces, though these were frequently insufficient to maintain internal security. On Baltu's flight, Mesud surrendered to Kutluşah and was pardoned and brought to the *ordu*, where Ghazan ordered him to be confined in Hamadan, probably in May–June 1297.¹⁰³

The administration of the province was meanwhile in uproar. Aqsara'i lays at the door of the new *sahib-i divan*, Cemaleddin Dastgirdani, responsibility for a series of arrangements that brought further ruin to Anatolia, but as Dastgirdani held office for only a month in October 1296 and was replaced by his old adversary Sadreddin Zanjani, the latter was in fact in control of the government during and after Baltu's revolt.¹⁰⁴ A fourfold administrative division was introduced, each under the responsibility of one of the chief officers of government. There was also a further proliferation of appointments, characteristic of Mongol administration in general: four *müstevis* in the *Divan*, two to administer the *dalay* lands and another two for the *injü*. Melik Pahlavan Ghuri was appointed to ensure that the heavy imposts of 60 *tumans* fixed on the Mongols' agent, Mücireddin, were collected, and then tried to mediate when Mücireddin used his influence to restore his position as *naibüs-saltana*. At the outset of Ghazan's reign, a possibly similar fourfold division, together with a drive to send surplus revenue back to the central *Divan*, was also put in place in Diyarbakır.¹⁰⁵

Another senior figure, Kur Temür the *yarghuchi*, was sent to revoke the transfers of private property carried out by Lakuşi, and to reclaim them for the central *Divan*. He had previously been sent by Ghazan, even before becoming Ilkhan, to raise money from the *injü* lands in Fars, but had been resisted by the

102 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 201–6; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1270–1, 1277, 1282.

103 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 197–8, 207–8; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1276; Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 341 (Hamadan). Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 480, says Mesud died in 697/1298.

104 Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1271; Boyle, 'Dynastic and Political History', p. 382; cf. Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 209, 232–3.

105 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 210–15, 217–28, esp. 226–8; [Anon.], *Nuzhat al-nazir wa rahat al-khatir*, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: Ms. Mxt. 355, f. 19v; cf. Cahen, 'Contribution', p. 71.

local tax-farmer. In Anatolia, too, he faced widespread unrest and petitions and soon returned to the *ordu* after his instructions were rescinded. Landowners were confirmed in their possessions but also in their liability for the 60 *tumans*, to be divided across the provinces. Part of the proceeds was paid to the treasury, but part was given to the tax-collectors of Rum, as a favour. One problem facing the administration was the loss of tax registers; some had been looted during the revolt of Taghachar, and others were later conveniently blown away and lost during a great storm near Konya, thus saving the historian, Aqsara'i, from an awkward investigation.¹⁰⁶

After the defeat of Baltu and submission of Sultan Mesud, the sultanate was bestowed on Mesud's nephew and long-time rival, Alaeddin b. Feramurz, who was last seen in Karamanid territory in 1281 (see above). His elevation to the sultanate was perhaps to reward the Turkomans for their lukewarm support for Baltu, though Celaleddin Rumi's followers claimed it was due to the intervention of the *atabey* (tutor, regent), Meceddin (Majd al-Din). Alaeddin returned to Rum, arriving in Konya on 20 October 1297; he was formally enthroned two days later.¹⁰⁷ Sülemiş, now commander in chief, evidently learning nothing from Baltu's failure, but, as a grandson of Baiju, perhaps giving expression to a persistent desire for independence from the Ilkhanate, rose in revolt himself. Spreading false rumours about events at the *ordu*, he killed his subordinates, mustered support from the *uc* and the Syrian borders, and took command of the troops stationed in the plain of Kazova.

Ghazan received news of the insurrection in November 1298, while wintering in southern Iraq in preparation for an invasion of Syria. The following spring, he despatched Kutluşah and Meceddin via Diyarbakır, on the heels of an advance force under Çoban. By this time Sülemiş had attracted a substantial force, including 20,000 men from Syria and a great rabble of followers, and was besieging Sivas. The two armies met at Akşehir near Erzincan on 27 April 1299; Sülemiş was defeated and fled to Mamluk territory, where his brother, Qutqutu, remained. His accomplices, Akbal son of Uruktu Noyan the Celayirid and Taştımur Hatayi, were captured. The latter was described as governor (*hakim*) of Rum and a 'clever charmer', despite being a Mongol! Ghazan Han held a great *quriltay* in Ujan and Akbal was executed (31 May). Finally, Sülemiş himself returned through Cilicia with Mamluk assistance, but while causing upheavals in the *uc* region he was unable to muster wider

106 Vassaf, *Tajziyat*, p. 319 (Fars); Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 216, 230–2.

107 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 236; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1286; Ahmed of Niğde, f. 150v (under 695 AH); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 132 (698); coins in Lindner, 'Hordes', p. 283 (697); Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, p. 849.

support. He fled to Ankara, where he was captured and sent to the *ordu*. Ghazan was then in Tabriz, where Sülemiş was horribly executed and burned, on 27 September 1299.¹⁰⁸

If these Mongol commanders, most of whom had long attachments to Anatolia, were hoping to resist the new centralising tendencies of Ilkhanid government, the effect of their defeat was the opposite. It is possible, however, that they were protesting against the shambolic financial administration that was depriving them of their incomes. Ghazan celebrated his victories with a massive issue of coinage, especially in 696 and 699 AH, after the defeat of Baltu and Sülemiş. The earlier coins are still restricted to eastern districts, but from 699 onwards, Ilkhanid coins are minted at numerous locations throughout Anatolia, particularly as assertions of central authority and as a way of making regional adherence to the Ilkhanid regime financially advantageous. But the new issues were also part of a reforming campaign to regularise and unify the administration of the empire. This clearly marks a turning point, though Seljuk models continued to be used and coins were also minted in the name of Alaeddin.¹⁰⁹

The retention of the sultanate nevertheless seems increasingly pointless. In May 1300, Alaeddin came to Diyar Rabi'a to present himself to Ghazan on his return from his first Syrian campaign. Impressed by this sign of loyalty, Ghazan reconfirmed his sultanate over the whole of Mongol Anatolia, from Erzurum to the Antalya coast, and from Diyarbakır to Sinop. At the same time, the sultan was married to the daughter of Prince Hülegü (son of Hülegü Han), a union that later saved his life.¹¹⁰

Proceeding back to Rum, Alaeddin, corrupted by the company in which he found himself, made a shameful progress via Diyarbakır, Harput, an unsuccessful assault on Malatya, and so to Sivas and Tokat. As the protests mounted, Alaeddin was summoned in June 1301 to the summer pastures of Abışga, now

¹⁰⁸ Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1287–9; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 239–42, 245–7, 270–1; Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 605 (confused); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 129 (Tashtemür); Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat*, p. 319; al-Yunini, *Dhayl Mir'at al-zaman fi ta'rikh al-a'yan*, ed. and tr. Li Guo as *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yunini's Dhayl Mir'at al-zaman*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1998), pp. 120–2; al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab*, vol. XXXI, ed. A. al-Arini (Cairo, 1412/1992), pp. 373–5.

¹⁰⁹ Lindner, 'Hordes', pp. 279–81; Lindner, 'How Mongol?', pp. 286–7; Ş. Pamuk and T. Aykut, *Ak Akçe. Moğol ve İlhanlı Sikkeleri/Mongol and Ilkhanid Coins* (Istanbul, 1992), pp. 134–53; A. P. Martinez, 'Bullionistic Imperialism: the İl-Xānid Mint's Exploitation of the Rüm-Saljūqid Currency, 654–695H/1256–1296 AD', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 13 (1993–4), 174. See also Judith Kolbas, *The Mongols in Iran: Chingiz Khan to Uljaytu 1220–1309* (London, 2006), pp. 336–8.

¹¹⁰ Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 259, 278–9; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1296 (Ghazan's movements).

military commander of the province. Rashly choosing to abscond and attempt to establish himself at Konya – presumably still seen as a royalist stronghold – he was captured. Abışga sent him to the *ordu*, where his wife interceded for him. Escaping with a beating, he was pensioned off to Isfahan, where he was knifed after insulting a rival at a gathering.¹¹¹

The restoration of Gıyaseddin Mesud in 702/1302–3 suggests that, despite everything, there was still a perceived need for some sort of local figurehead. Mesud arrived via Mosul, under the control of Abışga, and died in Kayseri in 1307, from a wasting illness. Coins are struck in his name till 702/1302–3, but seemingly not thereafter. He was the last of the Seljuks; however, various members of the family remained in the border regions (*uc*) and around the coast, such as Gazı Çelebi in Sinop.¹¹²

This period also saw the disappearance of local dynasties in Yazd and Kirman, in southern Iran, and the first minting of coins throughout the empire in the Ilkhan's name alone. It seems unlikely that the removal of the sultan as the titular head of local government during the reigns of Ghazan and his successor Öljeitü (1304–16) had any noticeable impact on the administration of Anatolia, as all senior appointments had already long been determined at the Ilkhanid court. As elsewhere, however, the attempted centralisation of Mongol rule was far from successful in providing a stable administration in Anatolia.

After the initial defeat and flight of Sülemiş in the spring of 1299, the resilient Mücireddin Tahir remained with Sutai in Kayseri with the task of reactivating the administration and dealing with the needs of the army. He had retained the confidence of successive Ilkhans since replacing his father Taceddin in 1280 as the principal agent of the *ordu*, but had been briefly displaced as *naibüs-saltana* by Kemaleddin Tiflisi at the beginning of Ghazan's reign. Distancing himself from the insurrection of Baltu, Mücireddin was at the *ordu* going through the accounts when news arrived of Sülemiş's uprising.¹¹³

111 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 279–91 (no date); Ahmed of Niğde, f. 151r (AH 700–1).

112 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 294, 301; Ahmed of Niğde, f. 151v. Mustaufi, *Guzida*, p. 480; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 134; D. E. Pitcher, *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire, from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century* (Leiden, 1972), p. 33; O. Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye* (Istanbul, 1971), pp. 644–5; al-Mufaddal b. Abi'l-Fada'il, *al-Nahj al-sadid*, ed. E. Blochet, in 'Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks (part III)', *Patrologia Orientalis* 20 (1929), 128, notes Mesud was sultan in 707/1307–8, but does not refer to him again. C. E. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties: a Chronological and Genealogical Manual* (Edinburgh, 1996), p. 213; Lindner, 'Hordes', pp. 282–3 (coins); O. Turan (ed.), *Tarihi Takvimler* (Ankara, 1954), pp. 78–9, refers to the accession of a certain Kılıç Arslan b. Keyhüsrev in 710/1310.

113 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 209–10, 239, 247.

The other officials in post during Baltu's revolt had attempted to keep their positions in the face of the newcomers arriving with Sultan Alaeddin, among whom was Şemseddin Lakuşi for a second term as *vezir*. Conflicting jurisdictions and the free scope for financial oppression during the period of Sülemiş's revolt led to many casualties, especially at the hands of Mehmed Bey, son of the Pervane, in Kastamonu and Konya. Lakuşi was caught up in Sülemiş's revolt and replaced as *vezir* by Sahib Cemaleddin, who, however, remained in Iraq most of the year 1298–9. It was into this shambles in Anatolia that the central *Divan*, now headed by Sa'd al-Daula Savaji and Reşideddin (Rashid al-Din), sent Nizameddin Yahya Faryumadi, member of an influential family of Khurasani bureaucrats, in 1300, following the execution of Sülemiş, to restore the flow of tax revenue to the central government. For his expenses, he was to levy a single silver currency *dinar* from every unit of plough land that was tilled by oxen belonging to the peasants, and no more.¹¹⁴

Nizameddin brought with him a whole train of Nishapuri and Khurasani *katibs* (scribes, secretaries), tax-collectors from Quhistan and other officials from all over the Ilkhanate. Among his first acts of oppression on reaching Erzincan was to seize the presents that the Seljuk sultan, Alaeddin, was bringing to Ghazan in Diyarbakır. As noted above, Alaeddin and his new train of officials only compounded the disorders that quickly became the hallmark of Nizameddin's regime, spreading from Erzincan to Sivas, Amasya, Tokat and everywhere he and his agents went. At first, the *müstevisi*, Şerefeddin Abdurrahman, a former governor of Tabriz, appointed over the winter of 1298–9, co-operated with him. However, faced with his oppressive actions, he fled to Mücireddin, who is presented as the sole source of stability in government at this time. Mücireddin was still busy trying with some success to revive Samsun, which had been systematically plundered by Mühezzibeddin Mesud, grandson of the Pervane.¹¹⁵

Nizameddin Faryumadi conceived a violent hatred for the *müstevisi* and had him attacked by an Ismaili from Quhistan; he died of his wounds on 11 June 1300. Mücireddin was at last compelled to go once more to the *ordu* to seek redress for Nizameddin's extortions, but he died at Qarabagh in Arran on 8 March 1302. Nizameddin was recalled, and after a hearing in Ujan, was executed en route for Hamadan, on 4 September 1302, on the complaints of the relatives of the murdered *müstevisi*, Şerefeddin.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 236, 241, 247–50, 252, 257–8.

¹¹⁵ Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 242, 256–7, 258–9, 264–5.

¹¹⁶ Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 269, 276, 292–3; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, p. 1306.

The following year, the Byzantine emperor, Andronikos, sought the assistance of the Mongols in his fight against the Turkomans round İznik (Nicaea), offering Ghazan the hand in marriage of one of his own daughters. Ghazan agreed, but died before he could send any assistance or marry the girl. In the spring of 1305, Andronikos sent another envoy, to Ghazan's brother and successor, Öljeitü, who apparently married the princess and promised to send troops.¹¹⁷ This is perhaps the context for the despatch of a powerful force under the command of İreñcin, the uncle of the Ilkhan, in June 1305, to protect the frontier. In this respect, as in many others, Öljeitü evidently inherited Ghazan's policies and his awareness of the disruptive potential of the Turkomans, particularly the Karamanids, whom he had identified as the chief obstacle to Mongol expansion in the west.¹¹⁸

Aqsara'i, a hostile source, gives a very negative view of İreñcin's activities, but he returned to court in July 1306, laden with gifts and swift horses, and was duly reappointed to the governorship later that year. İreñcin returned with a powerful army, making his winter quarters in Niksar. It was perhaps this force that the Byzantines hoped would take action against Osman and the beyliks in the west the following year, evidently in vain.¹¹⁹

The continuity of Mongol government in Anatolia was now restricted to the *vezirate* of Alaeddin Savi (appointed in 1300) and the long-standing command of Abışga, both of whom remained in office until the death of Ghazan in 1304. Abışga is praised for his justice and pure belief and is supposed to have become a disciple of Sultan Veled, son of Celaleddin Rumi.¹²⁰

In Diyarbakır, Ghazan's death was greeted with relief, owing to the extortionate fiscal regime in place there; envoys were sent to his successor, Öljeitü, who removed the Mongol *shihnas* and restored the fixed contributions on the local princes, who could thus retain any surplus. It is not clear whether similar reversals of tax policy applied elsewhere in Anatolia, as they did in Fars, for example. Regardless of official policy, İreñcin's oppressive regime reduced the other government agents to impotence. First, Şerefeddin Müsafir, nephew of the *sahib-i divan*, Sa'd al-Daula Savaji, took over Mücireddin's role in the

117 Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261–1453*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1993), p. 140; Rashid al-Din, *Jami' al-tawarikh*, pp. 1308–9; Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, ed. M. Hambly (Tehran, 1348/1969), p. 8 (marriage to 'Despina Hatun').

118 Al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, ed. F. Taeschner in *Al-'Umari's Bericht über Anatolien* (Leipzig, 1929), p. 28; tr. E. Quatremère, in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, vol. XIII (Paris, 1838), p. 345.

119 Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, pp. 44, 52; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 299, 309; Nicol, *The Last Centuries*, p. 140, Lindner, 'How Mongol?', p. 288.

120 Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, pp. 818–19; cf. Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, p. 285 (a pillar of Mongol rule).

collection of taxes on behalf of the central *Divan*, but the measures he put in place were overturned by his subordinates when he left the province. The emir Ağaceri, who had replaced Abışga as senior commander, was ignored by İrencin and was unable to obtain redress from the *ordu*. He returned to find İrencin dividing the spoils of office with Lakuşi, once more *vezir* (having apparently replaced Alaeddin Savi), and finally left the province in despair. Ögedei son of Shiktur Noyan, who was sent to administer the *injü* lands in Aksaray, had a similar experience and was driven out. Ali Padişah, brother-in-law of the Ilkhan, was sent to replace him. Despite becoming a disciple of Sultan Veled, İrencin was very much a Mongol of the old school.¹²¹

İrencin's misgovernment provided an opportunity for the Turkomans once more to advance their interests. Messengers arrived at the *ordu* with news of uprisings in the *uc* regions of Syria and Rum and most alarmingly of the capture of Konya by the Karamanids (described by Kashani as Seljuki Turkomans). Öljeitü responded to the deteriorating situation by despatching the senior emir, Çoban Suldus, in the summer of 1314; shortly afterwards, İrencin returned to court. Çoban installed himself in winter quarters at Karanbük (between Erzerum and Sivas), where most of the Turkoman leaders hurried to pay their respects. Among those enumerated are Hamidoğlu Feleküddin Dündar of Uluborlu; an Eşrefoğlu from Gorgorum (Ararım); the descendants of Sahib Fahreddin from Karahisar; Germiyan emirs and Alişiroğulları from Kütahya and neighbouring castles; Süleyman Paşa from Kastamonu; and the Armenian ruler of Cilicia. They were treated generously by Çoban and returned to their districts, but the Karamanids were conspicuous by their failure to present themselves. In the spring of 1315, Çoban moved on Konya. After some preliminary negotiations outside the city, the Karamanids requested a delay, then absconded in the night to Larende. Çoban, however, set off in pursuit and Karaman yielded on the promise of a safe conduct. Whereupon Çoban restored central control in Konya with the appointment of 'a malik, a *shihna*, tax-collectors and clerks'.¹²²

While Çoban was in Anatolia, Mamluk forces sacked the town of Malatya (April 1315), but he was unable to respond until the Syrian troops had withdrawn. He returned to the *ordu*, in Arran, in October, but evidently went quickly back to Anatolia: he was still there when news arrived of Öljeitü's

121 [Anon.], *Nuzhat al-nazir*, f. 23r; Cahen, 'Contribution', p. 73; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 304–9; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, p. 797; A. K. S. Lambton, 'Mongol Fiscal Administration in Persia (Part II)', *Studia Islamica* 45 (1987), 116–19; Aigle, *Le Fars*, pp. 150–2.

122 Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, pp. 168–70; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 310–12; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 132; Turan, *Tariki Takvimler*, pp. 70–71.

death the following year (16 December 1316).¹²³ He immediately headed east again, leaving his son Demirtaş in charge in Kayseri.

While these actions indicate the continuing precariousness of the Mongols' grip on the western part of their province, there was at least a modest revival of architectural patronage in Erzurum under Öljeitü, even if not due to the ruler himself. Mongol actions against the Karamanids in Konya evidently had the support of the Mevlevi dervishes and probably other urban religious groups, who were inclined to back the established regime against the disruptive forces of the Turkomans.¹²⁴

Details of Mongol rule in Anatolia during the reign of Öljeitü's son and successor, Abu Sa'id (1317–35), are scarce, and largely concern the ceaseless rotation of personnel. The *vezir*, Ahmed Lakuşi, was distrusted by Çoban, who assigned a certain Sinaneddin Ariz to be Demirtaş's chief adviser. Nevertheless, Demirtaş protected Lakuşi from an investigation of his malpractices when Celaledin Hoca, son of the *vezir* Rashid al-Din, arrived in Anatolia to supervise the collection of the provincial revenues. He too found a faithful patron in Demirtaş, when disputes at court led to the downfall and execution of Rashid al-Din in July 1318. However, in the end, Ahmad Lakuşi was not so fortunate, and Demirtaş was unable to save him from the *ilchis* sent from court in response to complaints from the agents of the Mongol emirs.¹²⁵

The Karamanids had not been entirely cowed by Çoban, and Demirtaş was en route for Niğde to protect Maden against their encroachments, when news arrived of İreñcin's uprising against Çoban in 1319. Rivalry between the two doubtless began in Anatolia and was compounded by İreñcin's removal first from this governorship, and then from Diyarbakır. Although the action against Çoban was instigated by Abu Sa'id himself, the Ilkhan was obliged to support his senior emir, and in the course of the reprisals that followed the defeat of İreñcin, many Mongol emirs with long connections with Anatolia were implicated and eliminated. Among them were Ecil and Arap, sons of Samağar, Sultanşah and Melikşah, sons of Baltu, and Abışga. Demirtaş himself, warned by his *vezir*, Celaledin, fled to Danişmend territory before news arrived of Çoban's victory. He thereupon sent

123 Abu'l-Fida, *al-Mukhtasar fi ta'rikh al-bashar*, tr. P. M. Holt as *The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince* (Wiesbaden, 1983), pp. 67–8; Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, p. 172; Ch. Melville, 'Abu Sa'id and the Revolt of the Amirs in 1319', in *L'Iran face à la domination mongole*, ed. D. Aigle (Paris and Tehran, 1997), p. 101.

124 R. H. Ünal, *Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d'Erzerum et de sa région* (Paris, 1968); Eflaki, *Manağib al-'arifin*, II, pp. 925–7.

125 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 312–17.

congratulations to Abu Sa'id and was confirmed in his governorship by his all-powerful father.¹²⁶

Demirtaş pursued an aggressive military policy in Anatolia, first attacking Ayas in Cilicia; the Mamluks reaped the benefits, annexing the town the following year.¹²⁷ This expedition necessarily involved passing through Karamanid territory and, at least to start with, Demirtaş seems to have cultivated peaceful relations with them. However, in 1323 he recaptured Konya and seized Musa Bey of Karaman and Hamidoğlu Dünder Bey. By now, if not already the previous year, he began to assert his independent power as 'Sahib-i zaman' and 'Şah-i Islam' in Anatolia. He struck coins in his own name, with the title 'Mahdi' – an attribute deserved, according to Aqsara'i, by his prohibition of alcoholic drinks throughout his territory, although the orders for such measures had probably issued from the *ordu* in 1320.¹²⁸

Demirtaş's insubordination, in terms that were evidently designed to win the support of the religious classes (if not of the Turkomans or dervishes, who were more successfully cultivated by the Safavid *şeyhs* Haidar, Junaid and Isma'il at the end of the fifteenth century), threatened the authority of his father Çoban at court. During the winter of 1323–4, Çoban went in person to seize his son and bring him before Abu Sa'id, who had little option but to pardon him.

On his reinstatement, Demirtaş continued his campaigns against the Turkoman emirates. He extended his authority over the region of Ağırlu with its important silver mines at Gümüş, and incorporated Tugancuk, west of Trebizond (Trabzon), and Kırşehir. He took the Eşrefoğlu capital at Beyşehir on 9 October 1326, captured and killed the doomed Prince Süleymanşah,¹²⁹ and pushed on towards the Mediterranean coast. In August 1327 he left his main baggage at Eğridir and despatched his lieutenant, Eretna, against Karahisar while he himself besieged the Hamidoğlu capital, Uluborlu. At this point, news arrived of the fall of his brother, Dımışk Hoca (24 August). Demirtaş returned to Eğridir in October and then moved to Kayseri to await further

126 Melville, 'Revolt of the Amirs', pp. 111–12; Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 317–23; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 133 (execution of twelve emirs of *hazaras* (Mongol military divisions of 1,000)).

127 Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 70–1; cf. Abu'l-Fida, *Memoirs*, p. 82.

128 Aqsara'i, *Musamarat*, pp. 324–6 (chronology unclear); Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 132; al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, pp. 51–2 (Quatremère, pp. 377–8); Mustaufi, *Zafar-nama*, f. 730r; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, pp. 977–8; Ch. Melville, "'The Year of the Elephant': Mamluk–Mongol Rivalry in the Reign of Abu Sa'id (1317–1335)", *Studia Iranica* 21, 2 (1992), 205 (ban on drink); Sümer, 'Karāmān-oghullari', p. 622a.

129 Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 132; al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, pp. 31–2 (Quatremère, pp. 349–51); Uzuncarşılı, 'Ashraf Oghullari', p. 703; Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, pp. 924–5.

news. On hearing of the fall of his father, Çoban, he contemplated reconciliation with Abu Sa'id, but also sounded out the Mamluk sultan, al-Nasir Muhammad, who was encouraging. Demirtaş finally left Kayseri on 22 December for Larende and so on to Egypt, where he was eventually executed at the request of Abu Sa'id and partly as a result of his arrogant and overbearing behaviour.¹³⁰

Demirtaş's relations with the Mamluks are not dissimilar from those fostered by Muineddin the Pervane in the 1270s, and subsequently by other Anatolian commanders such as Sülemiş, with the difference that by this period, the overt hostility between the Ilkhans and the Mamluks had been put aside in a treaty of 1323. Demirtaş had already sent envoys to Cairo in 1321, but his aggression against the nascent emirates, some of which had strong links with Egypt, caused various chiefs (such as the ruler of Antalya) to seek refuge there. Furthermore, his severe treatment of merchants in his realms prompted the Mamluk sultan al-Nasir Muhammad to write to his father, Çoban, in 1325, that Demirtaş was jeopardising the peace treaty.¹³¹

After the fall of the Çobanids, various governors were appointed in turn: Mehmed Bey, brother of Ali Padişah, Mahmud, son of Esen Kutluğ, and finally the Celayirid emir, Şeyh Hasan, known as 'Büyük', grandson of Akbuğa. During the last years of Abu Sa'id's reign, in 1334, Eretna, one of Demirtaş's chief officers, was involved in a conspiracy at court, pardoned, and sent back to Anatolia into the safe-keeping of Şeyh Hasan. Here, he seems already to have gained a considerable degree of authority, if Ibn Battuta's evidence from 1331 is not anachronistic.¹³²

Al-'Umari (c.1340) cites a chronologically and geographically rather confused Genoese report that Ilkhanid territory was in a stable state, administered by Mongol governors and some remaining Seljuks, until Demirtaş's expansion had given the Mongols control of an area as great as they (or the Seljuks) had

¹³⁰ Hafiz-i Abru, *Zail-i Jami' al-tawarikh*, London: British Library, Ms. Or. 2885, ff. 413r–414r; Ibn al-Dawadari, *Kanz al-durar wa jami' al-ghurar*, vol. IX, ed. H. R. Roemer (Cairo, 1960), pp. 345–9; al-Nuwairi, Leiden: Ms. Or. 19-B, ff. 134v–137r; Abu'l-Fida, *Memoirs*, p. 90; al-Maqrizi, *Kitab al-suluk li-ma'rifat duwal al-muluk*, ed. M. M. Ziyada, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1941–58), II, pp. 292–300.

¹³¹ Abu'l-Fida, *Memoirs*, p. 81; al-'Aini, *al-'Iqd al-juman*, Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmed III, Ms. 2912/4, ff. 367v–368r; al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, pp. 21, 23–4, 29–30, 50–1 (Quatremère, pp. 338, 341–2, 347, 375–6).

¹³² Abu Bakr Ahri, *Tarikh-i Shaikh Uwais*, ed. and tr. J. B. van Loon (The Hague, 1954), pp. 155–6, 157, tr. pp. 57, 58; Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 70–1; Shabankara'i, *Majma' al-ansab*, ed. M. Hashim Muhaddith (Tehran, 1363/1984), p. 314; cf. Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, vol. II, tr. H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1962), pp. 430–8, 533–5; Ch. Melville, *The Fall of Amir Chupan and the Decline of the Ilkhanate, 1327–37: a Decade of Discord in Mongol Iran* (Bloomington, 1999), pp. 38–9.

ever enjoyed. Nevertheless, Ibn Battuta's valuable description of the Turkoman emirates suggests that the Mongol presence in Asia Minor was limited to the region east of an arc between Aksaray and Niğde in the south and Amasya in the north. The largest city they controlled was Sivas and their main garrison was around Kayseri. Similarly, Hamd-Allah Mustaufi defined Iranian territory as stretching from Konya in the west to Balkh and the Oxus, but located the western frontiers in the province of Niksar and Sis (Cilicia) and over against Syria. His description of the high road from Sultaniyye to Konya misses out the last section of the route, from Sivas, perhaps a sign that control over this route was already rather vague by the time Öljeitü set up the milestones and certainly so by the time Mustaufi was writing (also c.1340). Kashani had already (c.1317) described Sivas as the border (*sarhadd*) of Rum.¹³³

This is consistent with the information that after the death of Demirtaş in Egypt, Hamidoğlu İshak Bey returned and regained his lands in September 1328, Paşa Musa Bey seized the stronghold of Gevele in February 1329, and the Karamanids captured Beyşehir the same year.¹³⁴ Most of Demirtaş's gains were thus as impermanent as those of previous Mongol assaults on the Turkomans. Mongol control was essentially confined to the eastern portions of the central plateau, where they retained many of their winter and summer quarters. It is in this area that the principality formed by Eretna, as a successor state to the Mongols, took shape.

The last phase: post-Ilkhanid dissolution, 1335–52

After the death of Abu Sa'īd in November 1335, the Ilkhanid state fell apart. Anatolia could hardly fail to become embroiled in the struggle to fill the vacuum at the centre. The two main contenders for power in the Mongol heartlands of north-west Iran, the Celayirids and the Çobanids, both launched their attempts from eastern Anatolia, but having done so, they were unable to incorporate the region into their own realms, so that it became, at last, truly independent. In the process, earlier links with the Mamluk sultanate also came to some sort of fruition, as the sovereignty of the Mamluk sultan was recognised, however nominally, rather than the rule of the remaining

¹³³ Al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, pp. 31, 32 (Quatremère, pp. 349, 351); Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, pp. 413–68; Mustaufi, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, ed. and tr. G. Le Strange (Leiden and London, 1919), pp. 20–1, tr. 22–3; Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, p. 80.

¹³⁴ Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 133; but cf. al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar*, p. 52 (Quatremère, p. 378); Sümer, 'Karāmān-oghullari', p. 622a.

puppet Ilkhans in Iran. The internal affairs of the region are very poorly documented; Mongol forces seem to have remained in the province, operating as elsewhere in the former Ilkhanate largely under the control of individual warlords, independently of any higher authority.

The Celayirid Şeyh Hasan was governor in Anatolia on the death of Abu Sa'îd, and senior emir throughout the brief reign of his successor, Arpa Ke'ün (November 1335–May 1336). When the Oirat leader, Ali Padişah, mounted a challenge for the throne, Şeyh Hasan was persuaded to go and oppose him. He left Eretna behind as his deputy. Success against Ali Padişah was followed by a victory against Taghai-Temür, a Chinggisid prince put forward by the Mongols in Khurasan, following which Şeyh Hasan appointed Eretna as governor in Anatolia.¹³⁵

Şeyh Hasan's triumph brought another contender into the arena, his Çobanid namesake Şeyh Hasan, known as Küçük, son of Demirtaş. Demirtaş's family had stayed behind when he fled to Egypt; now, pretending that his father had not in fact been killed, Şeyh Hasan ignored Eretna's request to present himself and rose in revolt at Karahisar in the name of a 'false' Demirtaş. He defeated his Celayirid rival at Aladağ in July 1338 and eliminated his puppet Ilkhan, Muhammad. An uneasy stand-off ensued, during which time Küçük Hasan caused much destruction in the region round Erzincan, but failed to capture the city.¹³⁶

In Anatolia, Eretna could only benefit from the upheavals to the east, and he played a delicate game of alternating loyalties to the various rivals. He struck coins throughout his territories in the name of Taghai-Temür in 739/1338–9, possibly reflecting Şeyh Hasan Celayir's temporary support for the Khurasanian candidate, possibly as a means of asserting his own independence from both the Çobanids and Celayirids.¹³⁷ The latter is more likely, as already the previous year Şeyh Hasan Celayir was reported to be advancing on Anatolia to bring Eretna to obedience. Eretna soon sought a more powerful protector in the shape of the Mamluk sultan, al-Nasir Muhammad. His embassy returned

¹³⁵ Ahri, *Tarikh-i Shaikh Uvais*, p. 164, tr. 64; Melville, *The Fall of Amir Chupan*, pp. 43–52; Cl. Cahen, 'Eretna', *El2*, II, p. 706.

¹³⁶ Ahri, *Tarikh-i Shaikh Uvais*, pp. 164–5, tr. pp. 65–6; Ch. Melville, and A. Zaryab, 'Chobanids', *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v, p. 499; Anon., *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq*, p. 133; A. K. Sanjian, *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301–1480* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 80.

¹³⁷ J. Aubin, 'Le *quriltai* de Sultan-Maydan (1336)', *Journal Asiatique* 276 (1991), 176; S. Album, 'Studies in Mongol History and Numismatics I: a Late Ilhanid Hoard (743/1342)', *Studia Iranica* 13, 1 (1984), 94; Ph. N. Remler, 'Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage: a Currency Community in Fourteenth-Century Anatolia', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 25 (1980), 171; Pamuk and Aykut, *Ak Akçe*, pp. 212–14; Mustaufi, *Zail-i Zafarnama*, facs. ed. V. Z. Piriev (Baku, 1978), p. 447.

from Cairo with confirmation of Eretna as Mamluk governor of Anatolia.¹³⁸ This represented the satisfaction of the Mamluks' long-term aspirations in the region and the culmination of a diplomatic association that went back to the parallel rise of the rival Mamluk and Mongol states in the Near East a century earlier.

Of course, Eretna did nothing to implement Mamluk rule – quite the reverse: he minted coins in late 739 / mid-1339 for the new Çobanid puppet, Süleyman Han.¹³⁹ His relations with the Mamluks were complicated by the support that they were giving to the rising power of the Dulğadır Turkomans, expanding northwards at Eretna's expense in the border regions of northern Syria. In 1337–8 they gained Elbistan and the following year seized the castle of Darende, where Eretna had stored much wealth. These developments led Eretna to complain to the Mamluk sultan, who countered with the accusation that Eretna himself was not upholding Mamluk sovereignty in the area; he again minted for the Mamluks in 740 / 1339–40. Despite these setbacks, however, Eretna was able to consolidate his territory by capturing, or recapturing, Sivas and at an unknown date also seizing Konya from the Karamanoğulları, with whom he tried at first to maintain good relations.¹⁴⁰

Eretna's flirtation with the Çobanids, who also disputed easternmost Anatolia with the governors of Diyarbakır, was equally short lived. During the course of 1340, Şeyh Hasan occupied Erzurum and laid siege to the town of Avnik.¹⁴¹ By 1341, Eretna felt able to issue independent coinage, though he continued to maintain the fiction of his subservience to Süleyman Han until his most renowned exploit, the defeat of Süleyman in October 1343 at Karanbük near Sivas.¹⁴² Eretna sent some of the spoils to the governor of Aleppo, and

¹³⁸ Al-Shuja'i, *Ta'rikh al-malik al-nasir Muhammad b. Qalawun al-salihi wa awladihi*, ed. B. Schäfer (Wiesbaden, 1977), pp. 25–7; al-Safadi, *al-Wafi bi'l-wafayat*, vol. VIII, ed. M. Y. Najm (Wiesbaden, 1971), p. 337.

¹³⁹ Album, 'Studies (I)', p. 78; Remler, 'Ottoman, Isfendiyyarid, and Eretnid Coinage', p. 172.

¹⁴⁰ Al-Shuja'i, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 22, 40, 68; cf. al-Maqrizi, *Suluk*, II, pp. 446, 459, 490, 494–5 and 665, 676 (Darende again); Album, 'Studies (I)', p. 96 n. 137 (coins); Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 70–1 (Sivas); Eflaki, *Manaqib al-'arifin*, II, p. 978–9 (Konya); Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', pp. 103, 112–13. A confusing account of these events, and of Eretna's relations with Karaman, in Şikari, *History of the Karamanids*, ed. M. M. Koman as *Şikari'nin Karaman Oğulları Tarihi* (Konya, 1946), e.g. pp. 40, 42.

¹⁴¹ Mustaufi, *Nuzhat*, p. 96, tr. p. 99; Mustaufi, *Zail*, p. 462; see S. Album, 'Studies in Mongol History and Numismatics II: a Late Ilkhanid Hoard (741/1340) as Evidence for the History of Diyar Bakr', *Studia Iranica* 14, 1 (1985), 49.

¹⁴² Remler, 'Ottoman, Isfendiyyarid, and Eretnid Coinage', pp. 172–3; Pamuk and Aykut, *Ak Akçe*, p. 219 (Süleyman coins); Mustaufi, *Zail*, p. 465; Ahri, *Tarikh-i Shaikh Uvais*, p. 169, tr. p. 70; al-Shuja'i, *Ta'rikh*, pp. 261–2; see also Şikari, *History*, pp. 57–8; Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', p. 105. Sanjian, *Colophons*, p. 84, cites an Armenian note that Eretna was defeated by Süleyman.

persisted in acknowledging the sovereignty of the Mamluks, when it suited him.¹⁴³

Eretna died in August 1352,¹⁴⁴ by which time he was the master of an extensive territory, issuing coins in his name over an area from Ankara to Erzincan and from Samsun to Niğde. The sources are fairly consistent in praising Eretna's character and justice, despite an accusation of hostile origin that he allowed his kingdom to fall into decay.¹⁴⁵ He is credited with striving to strengthen and promote the Shari'a, and to honour and esteem the *ulema*, *seyyids* and *şeyhs*, so that he gained the nickname 'beardless prophet' (*Köse peygamber*).¹⁴⁶

Following Eretna's death, his heirs, Mehmed I (1352–66) and Ali (1366–80), presided over the gradual reduction of their territory, in the face of the rivalry of the Karamanoğulları and Dulğadiroğulları in the south, and the İsfendiyaroğulları in the north, and aided by their own internecine struggles. Mehmed maintained diplomatic links with the Mamluks, and early in his reign had the satisfaction of handing over the refugee Dulğadır chief, Karaca, to the Mamluk sultan. Mehmed was obliged to call upon Mamluk assistance after a series of defeats by Mongol forces under a commander called Babuq, who captured and sacked Kayseri. Although the Eretnid was temporarily restored with the help of the governor of Aleppo, no sooner had the Mamluks returned home than the Mongols retook the city. The following year, in October 1365, Mehmed was murdered by a group of emirs.¹⁴⁷

His young son Alaeddin Ali quickly lost Konya, Niğde and Aksaray to the Karamanoğulları.¹⁴⁸ However, in 1368, Babuq, who was besieging Sivas, was abandoned by his Mongol troops, who went over to the sultan.¹⁴⁹ In 1375–6, Alaeddin briefly lost Kayseri to Mongol and Karamanoğulları forces, and Hızır Bey, a descendant of Samağar, later also made an unsuccessful bid for the city.¹⁵⁰ Soon afterwards (May 1378), Burhaneddin, chief *kadı* since 1365, became *vezir*. The fortunes of the principality came to depend increasingly on his energy and abilities, in the face of the continuing aggression of the Mongol forces and Karaman, and the total incompetence of the ruler.¹⁵¹ When Alaeddin

143 Al-Shuja'i, *Ta'rikh*, p. 263; al-Maqrizi, *Suluk*, II, pp. 635, 816.

144 Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 70–1; Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', p. 121.

145 Al-Maqrizi, *Suluk*, II, p. 863.

146 Shabankara'i, *Majma' al-ansab*, p. 314; Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', p. 113.

147 Al-Maqrizi, *Suluk*, III, pt 1, ed. S.A. Ashur (Cairo, 1970), p. 100; Ibn Khaldun, *Kitab al-ibar wa diwan al-mubtada*, 7 vols, ed. J. A. Dagher (Beirut, n.d. (?1967)), v, pp. 1186–7; Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 70–3; 'Aziz b. Ardashir Astarabadi, *Bazm va razm*, ed. K. Rifat (Istanbul, 1928), p. 79; Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', pp. 117, 123.

148 Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', p. 126. 149 Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 72–3.

150 Astarabadi, *Bazm va razm*, pp. 96–7, 111–13.

151 Astarabadi, *Bazm va razm*, pp. 76, 134, 142–7.

Ali died of the plague in August 1380, it was Kadi Burhaneddin who took power, albeit initially in the name of Ali's young son, Mehmed II; however, he soon proclaimed himself sultan. Burhaneddin vigorously defended his territories before being killed at Sivas by the Akkoyunlu chief, Kara Osman, in 1398. Two years later, Sivas was sacked by Timur. It was the Akkoyunlu who were able to fill the vacuum left by Timur's withdrawal from his Anatolian campaign of 1402, in which the Ottomans, who had steadily eroded the western lands of Eretna's principality almost up to Amasya, were thrown back.¹⁵²

Eretna's principality cannot properly be regarded as just one more of the Turkoman beyliks to emerge on the collapse of the Ilkhanate. Coinciding territorially with the heartlands of Mongol presence in Anatolia, the Mongol legacy remained strong, both in the continuing and disruptive presence of Mongol troops (such as the descendants of Baltu and of Samağar Noyan),¹⁵³ in Eretna's inherited rivalry with Karaman and the emerging Dulgadir Turkomans, and in the ambiguous relations with the Mamluk sultanate that had also been enjoyed by his former master, Demirtaş. Eretnid coinage shows more concrete continuities with the Ilkhanid models, while his sympathetic attitude to Islamic culture suggests that the urban character of late Seljuk rule was maintained in the chief cities of Sivas and Kayseri. There is evidence of rather refined cultural patronage continuing in the 1360s and 1370s, particularly associated with the Mevlevi order, at least in the field of manuscript production.¹⁵⁴ Burhaneddin's efforts to preserve this legacy ensured that east-central Anatolia remained distinct for some time to come and was more associated with events further east than with the rise of the new Ottoman power in the west.

The period in retrospect

Many scholars have tended to view the Akkoyunlu either as an obstacle to Ottoman eastward expansion or as a prelude to the establishment of an Iranian 'national state' by the Safavids.¹⁵⁵ The same might be said, at a much earlier stage of the same process, about Ilkhanid Anatolia, often dismissed as a hiatus

152 Astarabadi, *Bazm va razm*, pp. 180, 182, 222; John E. Woods, *The Aqquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, 2nd edn (Salt Lake City, 1999), esp. pp. 31–41; J. Rypka, 'Burhan al-Din', *EL* 2, 1, pp. 1327–8.

153 Sümer, 'Anadolu'da', p. 118; cf. Astarabadi, *Bazm va razm*, e.g. pp. 96, 112–13, for the 'anti-Muslim' threat of the Mongols.

154 Z. Tanındı, 'Seçkin bir Mevlevî'nin Tezhipli Kitapları', in M. Uğur Derman. *65 Yaş Armağanı*, ed. I. C. Schick (Istanbul, 2006), pp. 513–36.

155 Woods, *The Aqquyunlu*, p. 9.

in the development of a Turkish national state from its origins in the Seljuk sultanate of Rum. While echoing Cahen's view that 'it is ridiculous to consider the Seljuk period as a preface to the Ottoman period', we must leave it to the Ottomanists to assess the impact of intervening Mongol models and practices on Ottoman government and society in Anatolia. The replacement of Islamic caliphal sanction for rule by Chinggisid forms of imperial legitimation, the development of secular state law alongside the Muslim Shari'a, and altered concepts of landownership are among the legacies of the Mongol order based on the traditions of the steppes.¹⁵⁶ More immediately, it is useful to try to assess to what extent the Ilkhans simply followed the pattern of Seljuk rule in central and eastern Anatolia (as elsewhere in the Ilkhanate), and what distinctive and characteristically Mongol elements they introduced.

The impact of the Mongols' financial and economic regime was certainly severe, even if Mustaufi's celebrated statement of the decline in revenues to the *Divan* from 15 million *dinars* 'under the Seljuks' to 3.3 million *dinars* 'at the present day' (that is, after the collapse of the Ilkhanate) can only be interpreted in a most impressionistic manner. Such a fall might indicate a drop in agricultural or other productivity, due to political insecurity or a change from cultivation to a more pastoral economy in some areas. More probably, a greater proportion of revenue remained in the province than formerly; and the collection of revenue by the central *Divan* was inefficient, both in terms of incompetence and its cost.¹⁵⁷

It is clear that the Mongols were ready to extract as much 'tribute' from Rum as they were able, and they despatched a succession of agents to the province for this purpose, starting with Taceddin Mutez and his son, Mücireddin. Their efforts do not seem to have proceeded particularly smoothly. These and other senior officials, whether of local origin or sent from the *ordu*, were often more concerned with furthering their own local wealth and interests than with serving the needs of the central government, while the brief interventions of a stream of high-powered *vezirs*, such as Fahreddin Kazvini, Ahmed Lakuşi Tabrizi and Nizameddin Faryumadi, were oppressive and left the situation worse than they found it. Partly, this perception of Mongol financial administration derives from the negative views of Aqsara'i, himself a bureaucrat and constantly bemoaning the importation of foreigners, the multiplication and duplication of posts, and the incompetence and venality of the officials. The same complaints arise in other parts of the Ilkhanate, however, albeit also

156 Cahen, *La Turquie*, p. 348; Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the Historian Mustafa Ali (1541–1600)* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 273–92.

157 Mustaufi, *Nuzhat*, p. 94, tr. p. 95; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 301–2, 309–14.

from the same milieu of the indigenous bureaucratic classes, and there is no doubt that a divisive and unwieldy dual system was characteristic of Mongol government. Detailed studies of the administrative history (and particularly the financial administration) of Mongol Anatolia are needed before any firm conclusions can be reached about its impact on the province, how closely it evolved in parallel with developments elsewhere (such as Fars), and to what extent it replaced the existing Seljuk systems, or was merely superimposed upon them.¹⁵⁸

The fragmentation and overlap of authority also occurred in the conflicting roles of the civilian officials and the military commanders, as in the case of İreñcin under Sultan Öljeitü. Mongol *noyans* such as Samağar and Abışga often appear in the sources in a much better light than their civilian counterparts and were at odds with them. Here, again as elsewhere in the Ilkhanate, there was a tension between the Mongols' own attitudes to government and those of the administrative classes, which persisted after the Mongols had formally proclaimed their conversion to Islam. But there was not a straightforward dichotomy between these groupings; rather, we see the civilians collaborating with the *noyans* and entering into their factional alliances, and often more oppressive towards the tax-paying subjects than their masters were. In short, Mongol rule weakened concepts of the responsible exercise of power and fostered a corruption of government morality.¹⁵⁹

Fragmentation of the organs of Mongol rule spilled over into the territories they administered. This is most clearly visible in the frequent division of the puppet Seljuk sultanate itself, until the office became so devalued as to serve no useful purpose. The shared sultanates of İzzeddin Keykavus II and Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV and their descendants entailed the loss of territorial integrity of Rum and allowed the political history of the two portions to diverge and finally separate. There was no clearly defined locus of Mongol power: rather, a number of capitals, especially Erzurum in the east, Kayseri in the centre and

158 See Lambton, 'Mongol Fiscal Administration'; Royoko Watabe, 'The Local Administration of the Ilkhanid Dynasty: a Case of Fars', *Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 12 (1997), 185–216; and Aigle, *Le Fars* (for Fars); Vryonis, *Decline*, esp. pp. 245–6 (overview of Rum); Martinez, 'Bullionistic Imperialism', pp. 172–3. See also A. Z. V. Togan, 'Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period' [1931], tr. G. Leiser, *Annales Islamologiques* 25 (1991), 203–40. At the moment, we mainly have studies of offices and functions, e.g. A. C. Schaendlinger, 'Ämter und Funktionen im Reiche der Rumseitschuken nach der "Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī"', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1967), 172–92; A. Taneri, 'Müsâmeretü'l-ahbâr' in Türkiye Selçukluları Devlet Teşkilatı Bakımından Değeri', *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 4, 6–7 (1966), 127–71.

159 Aubin, *Émirs mongols*, for the clearest analysis of this.

Konya, stronghold of the Seljuk sultanate but increasingly under the threat of the Karamanoğulları, in the west. But, after the crisis of the late 1270s, it was the Mongol chiefs who wielded effective authority from their seasonal camping grounds, maintaining their traditional indifference to towns and leaving the *ahi* organisations to dominate and control urban life.¹⁶⁰

Such centrifugal forces had been equally present under the Seljuks, whose tendency to sub-divide the sultanate, influenced by Turkish steppe traditions, was if anything even more marked. They provided great scope for the Turkoman groups occupying the peripheries of the Anatolian plateau to assert their independence. In the struggle with the Turkomans, the Mongols inherited a situation already confronted by the Seljuks, although the problem did not start to become evident until the eve of the battle of Köseadağ, in the revolt of Baba Resul. Fresh waves of Central Asian nomads reaching Anatolia both ahead and on the heels of the Mongol invasions, less Islamised than the first Oğuz who accompanied the Seljuk invasions of the eleventh century, were an even greater challenge to the establishment of an urban-based, centralising regime, which did not anyway become the Ilkhans' priority until it was almost too late. The vicious punitive raids of Kongurtay, Geyhatu and even Demirtaş, especially against Karaman, incomplete as they were, do not seem to have been accompanied by any means of incorporating their territories more closely into the Ilkhanid administrative regime, although the great explosion of mint towns in the early years of Ghazan's reign, partly maintained by his successors, might signal such a development.

Finally, we should note the transformation of the religious landscape of central and eastern Anatolia during the course of this century. In the early Mongol period, Rum became a refuge for scholars and mystics from further east, finding sanctuary at the Seljuk court under the patronage of the sultans and Muineddin the Pervane. But urban society and the orthodox religious life, whether in the mould of the Sunni establishment or the great Sufi masters, was as alien to the Mongols and their predominantly Turkish followers as were Islamic political ethics. Rather, by undermining the authority of Sunni orthodoxy and their own religious openness, the Mongols gave a great impetus to the spread of dervish movements, which found fertile soil among the semi-nomadic Turkoman tribes and the rural hinterlands they inhabited, a trend already discernible in the late Seljuk period. The development of these popular

¹⁶⁰ Cf. F. R. Taeschner, 'Akhi', *El2*, 1, pp. 321–3; Cahen, *La Turquie*, pp. 315–20; Vryonis, *Decline*, pp. 396–402.

movements, heavily impregnated with 'Alid sentiment, had significant political consequences in the fifteenth century.¹⁶¹

Thus, although not accompanied by the physical destruction that they brought to parts of north-eastern Iran and Transoxania, the Mongol invasions of Anatolia introduced a period of considerable change, even if not necessarily of economic decline. New norms of government, an exploitative attitude to tax-collection that survived rather inconsistent efforts at reform, and the rise of independent principalities, partly as a Turkoman political reaction to imperial rule and partly a result of the deliberate transfer of land from state to individual ownership, all proved to be enduring legacies of Mongol rule. The Ilkhanid period also bound eastern Anatolia more closely to the political fortunes of north-west Iran, an orientation already created by the previous Seljuk Empire. This strengthened the dominance of Persian high culture but at the same time assisted the propagation of Turkish at the expense of Arabic, particularly in the border regions with Mamluk Syria, on the one hand, and northern Iraq, now part of the Mongol and post-Ilkhanid dispensation, on the other. A prolonged upsurge in popular religious movements accompanied this process. By breaking down existing patterns of political and religious life, the Mongols created fertile conditions for the forging of new amalgams with enormous dynamic energy. The effect of this was to be seen in the formation of the new Turkoman principalities that came to dominate the history of the next 150 years.

161 A. Yaşar Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIII^e siècle* (Ankara, 1989), pp. 38–46; M. F. Köprülü, *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, tr. G. Leiser (Salt Lake City, 1993), p. 24; cf. A. T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City, 1994), pp. 61–3.

Anatolia, 1300–1451

RUDI PAUL LINDNER

This chapter narrates and discusses some major lines of development in Anatolia between the turn of the fourteenth century and the second accession to power of Mehmed II. The emphasis lies on the early Ottoman enterprise, thanks to the fact that it had become the major power in the peninsula by the end of the 150 years under discussion. The end point of our coverage is entirely reasonable, as there is general agreement that Mehmed the Conqueror's reign was a turning point in the creation of one imperial polity and the wreck of another, Byzantium.

It is far from clear, around the year 1300, that anyone should have expected such an outcome, for in 1300 the Mongols seemed to be suzerains of the area we term the Ottomans' homeland.¹ In fact, the number of those in 1299 and 1300 who recognised the period as a caesura in Anatolia's history was small, perhaps a hundred people, almost all of them men. We do not yet know any of their names, but we do know that they were the moneyers active in the Muslim domains of the peninsula. From the 1280s until 1299, there were about ten mints striking silver *dirhems* for the Seljuks and Ilkhanids. For the years immediately after 1300, the number (now almost entirely for the Ilkhanids) is also around ten. But in 699/1299–1300, the number of mints striking silver *dirhems* shoots up to forty-six.² Such a phenomenon has not occurred before or since in the recorded history of Anatolia. It was at this time that the Mongol governor Süleymiş revolted against the Ilkhan Ghazan Mahmud, and the spectacular spike in the number of mints may well reflect a convulsive moment of transition.

In the decade immediately following the revolt, the Mongols not only attempted to re-establish some control over Asia Minor, the gradient of

1 See Rudi Paul Lindner, 'How Mongol were the Early Ottomans?', in *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, ed. R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan (Leiden, 1999), pp. 282–9.

2 Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Ann Arbor, 2007), pp. 91–2, figs. 1–3.

effective power running from a high in the east to a low west of the plateau, but there also occurred the collapse of Byzantine power in the west, the survival of the Byzantine remnant at Trebizond, and the growth of a number of Turkish emirates in the areas between Mongol and Byzantine Anatolia; we term these the beyliks, to emphasise their creation by Turkish chiefs, many of whom had not held high office for the Seljuks or Mongols.³ It is customary, however, given the ultimate predominance of the Ottomans and the nature of the surviving sources, to focus on the Ottoman experience.

Before turning to the sources, the history of scholarship on this era of Anatolian history, and in particular on early Ottoman history, makes a scenic detour advisable. There are a number of ways of assessing the previous few generations of work, but for the reader it may be convenient to distinguish between two points of view, one that might be termed deductive, the other inductive. These two perspectives are not set off in sharp relief one from the other. A deductive approach arises from meditation on, and perhaps the seizure of, a particular piece or constellation of evidence, from which a more general outlook seems to follow. The inductive approach is not based upon a random walk through the evidence, nor is the choice of questions to frame made within the confines of an uncluttered, not to say empty, mind. For many years, however, many treatments of this era rested upon a particular framework that remained untested, and the work grew out of a basic understanding built upon that framework. It is only in the past few years that scholars have, not without considerable reluctance, turned in search of other models or even set forth with paradigm lost.

The framework we have lost is that of Professor Paul Wittek, followed by many and in recent years adjusted slightly in the hope of responding to a larger base of evidence and avoiding certain claims that now appear dated.⁴

3 On the beyliks as a whole, excluding the Ottomans, the standard reference is İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri*, revised edition (Ankara, 1969; repr. 1988). There has been a great deal of work on individual beyliks since, much of it dedicated to the architectural history of a particular beylik or a comparison of types and architectural features across the beyliks.

4 The most widely read expression of the framework is in Paul Wittek, 'Deux chapitres de l'histoire des Turcs de Roum', *Byzantion* 11 (1936), 285–319, and *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1938). For a discussion of some issues arising from Wittek's formulation, see Rudi Paul Lindner, 'Stimulus and Justification in Early Ottoman History', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 27 (1982), 207–24. A recent, and sharp, refutation of the formulation in its more recent garb is in Colin Imber, 'What Does "Ghazi" Actually Mean?', in *The Balance of Truth: Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, ed. Cigdem Balım-Harding and Colin Imber (Istanbul, 2000), pp. 165–78. Colin Heywood has published a series of important studies on Wittek: 'The Frontier in Ottoman History: Old Ideas and

Wittek developed his ideas over a period of years extending from his service in the First World War through his years in Turkey during the heady era of the Atatürk dictatorship. On the basis of two early literary texts and an inscription dated to 1337, Wittek argued that the fundamental, driving factor in early Ottoman success was dedication to the *gaza* or holy war, that this religious zeal was central to Ottoman success, and that Ottoman failure followed from their abandonment of this fundamental tenet of their enterprise.⁵ Scholars following in Wittek's footsteps have moved away from his strong formulation, but have begun from his perspective and retain it in large part.⁶ It is probably safe to suggest that at the moment there is no agreed point of reference about which most scholars gather, and that a more eclectic approach, resting more on the sources than on scholarly tradition, holds the field.

Sources

The sources for the history of this era offer something for everyone. For the scholar used to the Byzantine sources or the Persian chronicles of the Rum Seljuks, a broad vista with many pleasing prospects opens up.⁷ The Byzantine chronicles continue to offer much help, especially with respect to chronology: here the so-called Short Chronicles have occasionally been crucial. There are also a number of 'official' documents that survive, especially from monastic houses, and new editions of these are largely complete. Texts of a religious nature (hagiographical, doctrinal, apologetic) provide assistance. There are, in addition, a number of texts that remain unpublished and that may be expected to throw additional light on particular topics (for example, imperial panegyric). Further, materials (many of them Italian in origin) that help to outline the economic history of the Palaeologan era also bear on Anatolia, occasionally in

New Myths', in *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, ed. Daniel Power and Naomi Standen (London, 1998), pp. 228–50; 'Wittek and the Austrian Tradition', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1988), 7–25; 'A Subterranean History: Paul Wittek (1894–1978) and the Ottoman State', *Die Welt des Islams* 38 (1998), 386–405; "'Boundless Dreams of the Levant": Paul Wittek, the George-Kreis, and the Writing of Ottoman History', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1989), 30–50.

5 In addition to the works previously cited, a central discussion of the inscription is in Colin Heywood, 'The 1337 Bursa Inscription and its Interpreters', *Turcica* 36 (2004), 215–32.

6 Among these have been Halil İnalçık, Stanford Shaw, Elizabeth Zachariadou and Cemal Kafadar.

7 A good list of the sources and editions is in Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300–1481* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 257–64.

depth.⁸ Such sources have helped develop the economic history of the beyliks, for which there are few surviving chronicles.⁹

Not much in the way of public and private documents survives from most of the Anatolian beyliks, and few of them found chroniclers whose work is extant. For the beyliks in central and western Anatolia, there are fundamentally two literary chronicles of note: the *Düsturname* of Enveri, which celebrates Umur Bey of Aydın, and a chronicle of the Karamanoğulları, written by a certain Şikari, which must be used with great care.¹⁰ However, the Ottoman archives possess a goodly number of documents, record books and the like, most of which are unpublished, much of which remains unstudied, some of which is still uncatalogued. And there are a small number of Ottoman chronicles produced in the course of the fifteenth century. Unfortunately, the chronicles can be highly tendentious, there are interesting gaps in coverage and there are occasional emendations; it is fortunate that not all of the alterations were skilfully done.¹¹ The early Ottoman chronicles have turned out to be less circumstantial and more elliptical than their Byzantine counterparts, but they are valuable monuments to the intellectual movements of the fifteenth century. Unfortunately, there is not a single extensive account for which a satisfactory edition, based upon all the manuscripts, exists. For example, the existing edition of the *Anonymous Chronicles* rests upon a late recension, and the widely used chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade is available in an old edition whose basis has not been investigated, a 'standard' edition that attempts in vain to locate an *Urtext*, and two recent texts, one of which pieces together the longest version possible, while the other limits itself to two manuscripts. There is much room for further textual studies among the early Ottoman chronicles.¹²

8 See A. E. Laiou and Charalambos Bouras (eds.), *The Economic History of Byzantium from the Seventh Century through the Fifteenth Century*, 3 vols. (Washington, DC, 2002).

9 See Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydın (1300–1415)* (Venice, 1983); and Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1999).

10 Enveri, ed. and tr. I. Mëlikoff-Sayar, *Le Destan d'Umür Pacha* (Paris, 1954); Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington, 1983), pp. 145–7. The new publication by Metin Sözen and Necdet Sakaoglu, *Karamannâme* (Istanbul, 2005), does not entirely supersede the older edition of Şikari by Mesut Koman, *Şikari'nin Karaman Oğulları Tarihi* (Konya, 1946).

11 For a gap of fifteen years in the description of the career of Orhan, see Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, 'Histoires et legends des premiers Ottomans', *Turcica* 27 (1995), 52; and for the 'Ottoman conquest' of Adrianople (Edirne), see Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: la pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomans', *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 439–61.

12 In this regard, there are two excellent introductory articles: Halil İnalçık, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, 1962), pp. 152–67; and V. L. Ménage, 'The Beginnings of Ottoman

Our knowledge of the post-Seljuk beyliks is very much restricted, thanks to the Ottoman conquest. We know much more of their architectural remains than we do of the processes causing the ebb and flow of their histories in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.¹³ Yet it is true that they formed an integral part of 'an entirely new Turkey that some of them were starting to fashion, a country on the move'.¹⁴ Although there are synthetic accounts of their place in the history of Anatolian Islamic art and architecture, there is no general account that compares and contrasts their political histories. There are, however, two accounts from the 1330s, one from the traveller Ibn Battuta, and the other, culled from the accounts of contemporaries, found in the geographical treatise of al-'Umari.¹⁵ Ibn Battuta visited most of the beyliks on his travels through Asia Minor, while al-'Umari contains two sets of accounts of both the large and small beyliks. Ibn Battuta's account contains information about the spread of the *fütüvvet* (*futuwwa*) movement in the towns, groups of artisans dedicated to shared religious experience and to a certain ethical norm: the adherents of these groups were known as *ahis*, and the title *ahi* occurs from time to time in the later chronicles as evidence of the memory of these groups, which provided links between communities at a time when disunity prevailed on other levels.

Historiography', in *ibid.*, pp. 168–79. An exemplary study of one chronicle is in V. L. Ménage, *Neshri's History of the Ottomans* (London, 1964). For a very interesting study of texts related to the Anonymous Chronicles, see Stéphane Yerasimos, *La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les traditions turques: legends d'empire* (Paris, 1990); Friedrich Giese (ed.), *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken in Text und Übersetzung*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1922–5); Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, Aşıkpaşazade Tarihi, ed. Ali (Istanbul, 1332 [1916]); Aşıkpaşazade, *Die altosmanische Chronik des Aşıkpaşazade*, ed. Friedrich Giese (Leipzig, 1929); [Aşıkpaşazade] Aşıkpaşaoğlu Ahmed Aşiki, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, vol. I, ed. N. Çiftçioğlu (Istanbul, 1949), pp. 91–319; Aşıkpaşazade, *Osmanoğulları'nın Tarihi*, ed. Kemal Yavuz and M. A. Yetka Saraç (Istanbul, 2003).

- ¹³ The standard account is Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu beylikleri*, to which one may add the relevant articles on individual beyliks in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2006) [henceforth *El2*]. Since 1969 there has been a flood of work on individual beyliks published in Turkey, including important works on architecture and the publication of significant collections of coins. For an example, see Şennur Şentürk, ed., *Asya'dan Anadolu'ya Rüzgar* (Istanbul, 1994), sampling the beylik coins found in the Yapı ve Kredi Bank.
- ¹⁴ Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, tr. J. Jones-Williams (London, 1968), p. 313. This first English edition contains some useful material not in the revised French version, *La Turquie pré-ottomane* (Istanbul and Paris, 1988), or *The Formation of Turkey*, ed. and tr. P. M. Holt (London, 2001).
- ¹⁵ The best entry into the account of Ibn Battuta remains the annotated English translation by H. A. R. Gibb: Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, vol. II (London, 1962), based upon the edition by Defremery and Sanguinetti; al-'Umari, *Al-'Umari's Bericht über Anatolien*, ed. Franz Taeschner (Leipzig, 1929). The latter account contains precious and often puzzling information about soldiery, weights and price levels, which deserve careful inspection and evaluation.

The beyliks

Why did the beyliks not last? After all, politically some of them, on the west coast of the peninsula, seem to replicate the geographical and economic advantages of many of the city-states of Greek antiquity. It would be foolhardy to attempt a definitive answer to this question at the present time, especially as it is really a restatement of another question to which a definitive answer still eludes us, namely, why did the Ottomans, of all the beyliks, achieve ultimate success? But framed in terms of the beyliks, among the ideas that come to mind, one may deserve further study. Perhaps the majority of the beyliks did not have the resources to project their power or the need to obviate the perceived threat of a neighbour. In some cases, the nature of the military technology on which their forces were based was insufficient to allow them more than occasional raids: here one has in mind the plateau and southern coastal beylik of Karaman, whose forces had been nomadic, but without enough nomads. Along these lines, the Ottomans would have had certain advantages: a nearby and weak enemy in Byzantium, an early turn from nomadic towards sedentary warfare (after 1329) and the ability to develop resources in Europe in the 1370s. But these are early days in the development of a thoughtful historiography of these little jewels of statelets.

The point here is related to the history of the polities in Inner Asia after the Timurid era. In order to break out, as had the Mongols in the thirteenth century and the forces of Timur in the fourteenth, it was necessary to have the appropriate military and economic resources: and for a military arm largely dependent upon nomads, this condition translated into a sufficient number of nomads with a sufficient number of remounts. The post-Timurid attempts at building a greater enterprise were strong enough to create local clienteles in town, steppe and agricultural environments, but did not manage to gather enough force to overcome the opposition of similarly situated and endowed opponents. Ultimately, these polities fell prey to the expansion of states based upon sedentary resource bases.

The beyliks of Anatolia were smaller, had fewer resources and did not have large hinterlands of steppe or oasis. Among the fascinating, and not yet fully tested, materials presented by al-‘Umari’s informants are figures for the military of each beylik. It is not clear just what these figures represent, and they do not appear all to have been gathered on the same basis. For example, the Eşrefoğulları are said to have had more than 60,000 mounted soldiers, that is to say the equivalent of six *tumans*, which appears impossible, given the constraints of geography. However, it does look as if these figures, over all,

represent the limits of power of the beyliks, and on that assumption it does begin to look as if none of them, without easy pickings on the frontiers, could assert itself over the others. Perhaps one of the beyliks on the Aegean coast might have been able to gather the requisite resources through the projection of sea power, but none of them was, in the end, able to do this, perhaps because the resources of the hinterland limited the construction of proper fleets, perhaps because none of them lasted long enough to develop a strong and independent seafaring tradition, as had Venice and Genoa. In any event, the map of the beyliks appears for the most part to involve tradeoffs without opportunities for easy growth. The one exception to this is the Ottomans, who were closest to a weakening enemy and had the least difficulties in taking advantage of opportunities in the Balkans.

It is traditional in the writing of histories in this area to focus on the rise of the Ottomans rather than to provide a series of histories of the beyliks, and this chapter will not stray far from that tradition. However, it is useful to say a few words in passing about the larger of the beyliks and to offer some comparative comments that might help in the organisation of their histories as a whole. Here again we are at the mercy of our sources, not all of which have been fully analysed.

In fact, one of the source problems may provide a hint as to processes that prevented the expansion and growth of certain of the fourteenth-century beyliks. The Ottoman chronicles tend to hide difficulties between brothers and generations of the ruling house, but it does appear that some sons of the ruling leader in the early period played a role in governing districts and, later on, provinces. However, we do not see examples of rule over the entire enterprise divided between brothers. Whether this became a custom early on is unclear, and it may have been the result of accident becoming transformed, by chance repetition, into habit. We are not talking here about succession to rule but about the potential division of the polity among members of the same generation. Again, it is not clear whether this result is the outcome of design or of contingent events.

At the same time, those who have laboured to establish accurate chronologies for some of the beyliks are faced with the decision of identifying as one and the same person distinct rulers whose names do not match. Is this the result of memory lapse on the part of our medieval authors? Is this the outcome of those authors' reliance on partial names or even nicknames? Often, however, there is evidence that members of the same generation ruled different, distinct parts of the same beylik.

For example, control of the beylik of Hamid, in Pisidia and Pamphylia, was divided between two branches, one at Eğridir and the other at Antalya. In the 1330s two brothers divided the beylik of Karası between Balıkesir (Balıkesri) and Bergama, and a similar division continued into the next generation. In the third quarter of the fourteenth century, three brothers ruled different districts of the beylik of Menteşe. In the early fourteenth century, there seems to have been a division of the Teke beylik as well. On occasion, there was the rule of a sole sovereign during one generation, followed by a division of the polity during the next. At times it seems as if one is looking at the dynastic history of Merovingian Gaul *in parvo*.

One possible corroboration of this line of argument is the policy followed by Timur after his defeat of Bayezid I in 1402. Bayezid had seized control of most of the beyliks during the 1390s, but Timur restored them to their original dynasts: however, some of these were again ruled jointly, which ultimately made for divisions and eased the Ottoman reconquest one or two decades later. The chief who had united the steppe and sown land of the Ulus Chaghatay appears to have wanted no strong rulers in Anatolia. It is significant that after Timur reconstituted some of the beyliks, they proved incapable of establishing an institutional structure sufficient to ward off the Ottomans within a generation of 1402. They seem to have continued on the basis of their earlier practices, which proved just as insufficient as they did in the 1390s.

What this suggests is that the nature of divided rule played a role in preventing the consolidation of resources, of power and of the ability to conquer. It was possible to quarrel within, but not to expand. Did this have an impact on trade within the peninsula? The fact that there is little evidence of the continued construction of caravansarys on the Seljuk model does not necessarily count for very much. New caravansarys would have been needed to accommodate an increase in the number of traders, caravans and a growing volume of goods, or new construction might have been needed to counter an increase in banditry; but there is little record of either. The existing network appears to have been sufficient unto the day. We also have the slim evidence of Ibn Battuta, who appears to have travelled without much let or hindrance in the early 1330s.

If we search for another measure, across the beyliks, of their success, there is a certain amount of good fortune in the remarkable growth of the discipline of art history in modern Turkey, which has bequeathed a large number of local studies, some antiquarian, some of remarkable sophistication, all useful

in ferreting out the remaining medieval monuments.¹⁶ The remaining architectural works differ from one another in the eyes of connoisseurs, but they are for the most part not very large or ornate. Smaller work in tapestry, wood and ceramic is not rare, but it does not reveal the availability of a large surplus of wealth. The coinages of the beyliks do not compare, in volume, weight standards or design, to the issues from the Seljuk mints; but perhaps a large volume of new coinage was not needed.

There are many difficulties associated with the chronology, lists of rulers and internal histories of the beyliks, and it seems best for the moment to discuss them in rather different terms. The beylik immediately to the south-west of the Ottomans was Karası, in Mysia, whose history begins in earnest after the Catalan expedition of the early fourteenth century. Bordering on the Marmara, the Dardanelles and the Aegean, this beylik had some naval pretensions and may have benefited from the immigration of Turks from the Dobrudja. The power, however, of the beylik was insufficient to wrest Mytilene (Lesbos) from Christian hands. Soldiers from this beylik played a role, along with Ottoman volunteers, in the Thracian adventures before the definitive Turkish installation across the Dardanelles. There is very sparse coinage remaining from Karası, and it appears reasonable to suggest that the beylik, which fell definitively to the Ottomans after various earlier partitions at the end of Orhan's reign, was hampered by its inability to control the sea routes and by its more powerful neighbour to the east, Germiyan.¹⁷

The beylik of Saruhan was centred on Lydia and lasted from the early fourteenth century to 1410, when it finally fell to the Ottomans. The capital of the enterprise was at Manisa, but members of the family of the Saruhanoğulları had subsidiary and perhaps partly autonomous residences elsewhere. From an early date the rulers of Saruhan involved themselves in campaigns at sea, where they were associated with the forces of Aydın. They were also enmeshed in politics and warfare involving the Genoese at Chios and Phocaea. On the one hand, Manisa prospered: there was a slave market and some significant building in the 1360s and 1370s. On the other, the forces of the emirate seem to have been unable to establish complete independence from the currents of war and diplomacy fostered by the

16 For an overview see Gönül Öney, *Beylikler Devri Sanatı XIV.–XV. Yüzyıl (1300–1453)* (Ankara, 1989). To the works mentioned within should be added the large number of local histories, such as the works of İ. H. Konyalı on central and south coastal Anatolia.

17 E. A. Zachariadou, 'The Emirate of Karasi and that of the Ottomans: Two Rival States', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1993), pp. 225–36, who sees the beylik as more powerful, at least initially.

Ottomans after 1360, Byzantium after the 1340s and the more powerful rulers of Aydın.

Aydın appears to have been the most influential of the coastal beyliks, and it is, with the exception of the Ottomans, the sole western beylik from which we have a narrative source of some scope, the *Destan* of Umur Paşa. The dynasty, formerly allied with the beys of the Phrygian emirate of Germiyan, established itself around 1308 and shortly thereafter ruled from Birgi, although much of the Smyrna (İzmir) district, and the city itself, became part of the principality. Once again, although the head of the family claimed supreme authority, other members had their own separate residences with more or less autonomous power.

Smyrna/İzmir was then, as now, an economic centre of the Aegean basin, and the dynasty became involved in warfare with the Genoese, trade arrangements and diplomacy with the Byzantines: it even issued imitations of Italian coins. Umur Bey (1334–48), hero of the *Destan*, allied himself with the Byzantine claimant John Kantakouzenos, and forces from Aydın became involved in the Byzantine civil wars of the early 1340s. It proved impossible, however, to deal both with possibilities in the Balkans and with threats from the sea caused by crusaders called forth by the pope and including a number of European naval powers. Ultimately, Umur Bey died in battle at İzmir. After his death, his successors reached an agreement with the European powers in 1348, one that crippled the naval power of the beylik and threatened to lower its trade revenues substantially. The beylik continued to be influential but without offering the same naval threats as before: it is probable that its wealth for the next few generations depended more on trade and internal growth than on the opportunistic raids of Umur Bey's career.

There are significant architectural monuments of the era: mosques, *medreses* and tombs. Perhaps the most significant of the monuments is the İsa Bey mosque in Ephesus (1374). There are also important works translated from Persian into Turkish from the Aydınoğulları period, an indication of the development of Turkish as a written language of high culture.

South and south-east of Aydın was the beylik of Menteşe, based in Caria. The founders of this beylik had at one time been tributary, at least in principle, to the Seljuks, since there are extant coins struck at Milas in 1291 in the name of the Sultan Mesud II. Both Ilkhanid and Byzantine campaigns entered the region in the last decades of the thirteenth century, but there was no long-term opposition to the infiltration of nomads from the hinterland and Turks from the sea (from Antalya). After 1308, the major naval opponent of the beylik was Rhodes, which remained stubbornly independent throughout the fourteenth

century. Once again, family rule prevailed in the beylik, and once again, much of the wealth came through trade, some of which involved products exported from the interior of the peninsula to the Aegean through the beylik's ports. The dynasty fostered the translation of works from Persian into Turkish, and there are important Menteşeoğulları buildings at the centres of family rule, in particular the Hacı İlyas mosque at Milas (1330). This was yet another of the beyliks that fell to Bayezid I, was reconstituted by Timur, but failed to withstand the Ottomans after their resurgence.

The beylik of Teke was centred on the southern port of Antalya, and included parts of Lycia and Pamphylia. Antalya had been in Seljuk hands since 1207, and the hinterland was connected with the important port through a network of caravansarys by the middle of the thirteenth century. After Seljuk rule in the south-west part of the peninsula faded away around 1307, a part of the family of Hamid, in Pisidia, established itself as the beylik of Teke; again, members of the family ruled in different towns. Antalya had been a prosperous trade centre, facing Cyprus, and there was, in the middle years of the fourteenth century, both warfare and trade between the two. Whereas there is a fair amount of Seljuk material remaining in the area, from the Tekeoğulları little survives (there is a *türbe* dated 1377 in Antalya, reminiscent of Seljuk architecture).¹⁸

Reviewing the status of the coastal beyliks curving west of the Ottomans around the Marmara basin and the Aegean, as far as the lands opposite Cyprus, there are a few interesting points that rise above the minutiae of their separate and in many ways still confusing year-to-year history. First, their attentions seem fixed more on the sea than on the hinterland. Second, as sea powers their emphasis was on trading and raiding rather than conquest; or, at least, their power was insufficient to wrest control of significant islands from the more distant European naval powers. Third, a few of them were able to provide troops for service in the Balkans, but they were unable to establish and retain a constant presence for their enterprises across the sea. They could assist in Balkan actions, but they were unable to direct them or to set up a permanent base. In the end, during the reign of Murad I, the Ottomans encapsulated the Balkan adventurers from the coastal beyliks. Fourth, they appear to have benefited substantially from a transit trade linking merchants from the interior with European middlemen. This trade appears to have consisted of both primary goods, including slaves, and partially finished goods. Finally, although most of them issued coins, the output appears to have been far less, and of far

¹⁸ For the *türbe*, see Gary Leiser, 'Teke-oghulları,' *Elz*, x, pp. 412–13; and Barbara Flemming, *Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien und Lykien im Spätmittelalter* (Wiesbaden, 1964), p. 90, for Hamid.

lower quality, than that of the Seljuks or Ilkhanids, and on the basis of scanty evidence it seems that the output of copper was greater than the output of silver, which might, if true, imply that the beylik coinage was destined for small transactions, while the extant currencies from the hinterland (and, presumably, from Venice and Genoa) served the long-distance trade. Much more will be secure once scholars have fully evaluated al-‘Umarī’s materials on price levels and measures, which must be considered in terms of the Mamluk models he had in mind.

Next we may turn to the larger beyliks in the hinterland: Germiyan, Hamid and Karaman. The name of the first of these is the first to appear in the sources. By our period, Germiyan was centred on Phrygia, although the ruling family had been associated with the Seljuks initially in south-east Anatolia and then later in the west.¹⁹ In the last quarter of the thirteenth century they were sometimes nominally loyal to the Seljuks and sometimes acted independently; at one time they were subservient to the Ilkhanids, although just what that meant in practice is unclear. At the end of the thirteenth century, from their centre at Kütahya, their influence appears to have reached as far as Ankara, at least briefly. Yakub b. Alişir, about whom al-‘Umarī wrote, was an impressive ruler, some of whose lieutenants founded beyliks along the coast. The Ottoman chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade claims that the forces of Germiyan threatened the Ottomans’ southern flanks during the first few decades of the fourteenth century. The economic resources of the beylik appear to have been well developed: sources discuss the manufacture and marketing of high-quality weaving, a trade in horses (the beylik contained both land suitable for intensive agriculture and areas ideal for steppe animal husbandry) and trade in such raw materials as alum. In the second half of the fourteenth century the beylik no longer had free access to seaports, and became dependent upon the Ottomans for support against the beylik of Karaman. Bayezid I annexed the beylik in 1390, and although Timur re-established the family, and in the early fifteenth century the Ottomans made no attempt to extinguish it by force, it became part of the neighbouring enterprise in 1429. The Germiyanogulları erected a number of mosques and *imarets*, and established a number of *wakıfs*, and they were also patrons of literature and of translations of works from Persian into Turkish. In the fifteenth century, at the end of the dynasty, a number of poets writing in Turkish worked at the court. The quality of fourteenth-century Germiyanid coinage is notably superior to that of many of the other beyliks.

19 See Mustafa Çetin Varlık, *Germiyan-Oğulları Tarihi (1300–1429)* (Ankara, 1974).

The base of the beylik of Hamid was Pisidia, and from the highlands and lakes the power of this dynasty spread south to the area discussed under Teke. Rule was divided between two branches of the family, but the area included a major trade route from the Mediterranean up country to the pastures and lakes. There is little information about this beylik, although it is clear that at a time when the other beyliks were flourishing, that is, when the central Mongol power in Iran was waning and before the spread of Ottoman claims, the Mongol governor Timurtaş ravaged the territories and crippled the government of Hamid, as well as bringing to an end the lesser beylik of the Eşrefoğulları (whose temporary wealth and influence appears reflected in the building programme at Beyşehir at the turn of the fourteenth century). Hamid is an example of a beylik attempting to balance itself between the Mongols on the one hand and the expansion of trade from the Antalya coast on the other.

The beylik of Karaman is the great exception, or perhaps better, it is the beylik which in some ways seemed best able to pick up the pieces after the Mongols disestablished the Seljuks. Already in 1277, when the family first took aim at rule in Konya, their declared policy was to replace Persian with Turkish as the court language. However, in many ways the dynasty looked to the past and relied on technologies that did not succeed in the long run, foremost of which was reliance upon a nomad military arm.

The Karamanids first came to notice in the area around Ermenek, which harbours routes to the south-east and Cilicia as well as over the Taurus and the great central plains east and north of Konya. Many of the family's supporters were pastoralists, although they do not seem to have been the military equal of Mongol mounted archers in contests from 1277 on: the Karamanids were able to raid and occupy towns but not to defeat the Mongols. It was not until the departure of Timurtaş in 1327 that the Karamanids were able to effect a decisive occupation of Konya, and even then, for the next generation they had to counter the threats of the Eretnids, who had originally acted as lieutenants of the Mongols. By the end of the third quarter of the fourteenth century, the dynasty controlled most of the Lycaonian plain as well as the lands running south beyond Ermenek to the coast.

The early contacts between the rulers of Karaman and the Ottomans were diplomatic, ending in a marriage alliance, which did not prevent warfare from breaking out over the legacy of the beylik of Hamid. Bayezid I annexed the beylik, and the Ottomans found themselves facing future confrontations with the Karamanids' sometime allies, the Mamluks. The final conquest of the beylik of Karaman after its reconstitution by Timur goes beyond the bounds of this chapter, but it is useful to note that supporters of members of the

dynasty were always able to seek refuge in the rough hill country from which the pastoralists had first set forth in the thirteenth century. The last eruption from Karaman enthusiasts occurred in 1500–1.

To some extent, the beys of Karaman, once they ruled in confidence from Konya, inherited some of the advantages that the Seljuks had enjoyed in the 1220s and 1230s. They did not control the north coast of the peninsula, but they did have access to the Mediterranean, and a network of trade routes converged on and diverged from Konya. They shared control over the Taurus passes with Armenian lords, and they were able to extract duty from Italian merchants at a number of south coast ports. The Lycaonian plain was rich in horses and sheep, which allowed the export of animals, raised by tribes known as horse drovers (*At Çeken*), and quality woven goods (textiles from Aksaray). The wealth so obtained went in part to continue the traditions of Seljuk art and architecture.²⁰

The sizeable interior beyliks differed from their coastal neighbours in a number of ways. Each had much less of a Byzantine legacy and rather more of a Seljuk and Mongol imprint. Although Karaman had a long coastline, it did not build a fleet of raiding vessels as did the beyliks facing the Aegean. They had a larger pastoral element to their economies and populations. One institution that they all shared, however, was urban adherents to the *ahi* brotherhoods, and if we understand Ibn Battuta correctly, it was these brotherhoods that provided certain social and also economic links that crossed the frontiers between the beyliks. Further, the opportunities for a sudden enhancement of their position, such as a successful raid or alliance with a European power might bring, really did not exist: aside from attacking a neighbour, the opportunity to increase one's power grew only as the post-Mongol enterprise of the Eretnids lessened in importance. Karaman was the big winner here. However, none of the interior beyliks had the power to withstand the growth of the Ottomans, and it is worthwhile considering why this was the case. It may rest in part on the conservative nature of the military forces of the beyliks, or on the lack of a pragmatic administrative structure (it is typical in the scholarly literature to see the beyliks as carrying on the Seljuk traditions), or perhaps on contingent events about which we are presently ignorant.

The Candaroğulları or İsfendiyoğulları, east and north of the Ottomans, form one of two interesting beyliks on the north coast of the peninsula. The dynasty established itself in the last decade of the thirteenth century under

20 The classic survey, representing two traditional approaches, is Ernst Diez, Oktay Aslanapa and Mahmud Mesut Koman, *Karaman Devri Sanatı* (Istanbul, 1950); there are numerous later publications of particular monuments and genre examples.

murky circumstances involving the Seljuks and Ilkhanids. The dynasty minted coins under Ilkhanid suzerainty in the early fourteenth century, and its two centres were Kastamonu and the port of Sinop. There are reports of a large nomad population in the area at the end of the thirteenth century, and some evidence that certain of the groups responsible for revolts against the Seljuks in 1238 had relocated there, but the sources tell us relatively little about nomadic activity. Rule was usually divided between the members of the family ruling in Kastamonu and Sinop, and the bases of power were probably different in kind, since Sinop was a great entrepôt. Once again, Bayezid I subdued the beylik and Timur saw to its reconstitution; the beylik lasted until 1461. Trade, exports of raw materials (copper, iron) from the Pontic mountains and a competent navy preserved the beylik for some time. In some ways this beylik is similar to its neighbour to the east, the Byzantine 'beylik' of Trebizond (Trabzon), which enjoyed prosperous agriculture in the valleys of the Pontic alps, had control of the coastal end of a major route to Iran and also held out until the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror. These two northern polities were influenced by the Mongols on the one hand and by the European trading cities on the other; the coinage of Kastamonu betrays Mongol influence, while the Trebizondine issues bear a relation to the Venetian issues.²¹

How different were the beyliks from the Seljuk sultanate of Rum? Most obviously, they were smaller and more compact. They had fewer resources but at the same time fewer obligations. A number of the beyliks existed on land which had not known Muslim rule before, and these faced both a Byzantine past and a maritime legacy. While some were founded by former officials familiar with the scribal traditions of the Seljuks, others grew from Turkish nomad tribes. All of them reflected greater or lesser Mongol influence, sometimes only in linguistic usage, occasionally in institutional practice, often in military orientation, and certainly to some extent in the source of their population, for of the Mongol *tumans* that entered Anatolia in the 1250s, not all returned to the east. When the new immigrants settled the coastal cities in the fourteenth century, they built up new areas: the new mosques are often outside the older Byzantine settlement. In the cities and the courts, Turkish became more and more the language of choice, and there was a considerable amount of translation, along with new literary production in poetry and prose. Some of the beyliks were modest centres of patronage for this literature, and most experimented with the construction of a Friday mosque, occasionally departing

21 For the coinage see Celil Ender, Üstün Erek and Gültekin Teoman, *Candaroğulları Beyliği (İsfendi-yaroğulları Beyliği) Paraları Kataloğu* (Istanbul, 2003), pp. 33–52.

from Seljuk models.²² There was probably less trans-peninsular trade, but there was more trade from the plateau to the Aegean coast, as well as the development of pastoral production (animals, textiles) in the lowlands newly settled by Turks.

The Ottomans

Of the beyliks, it was the Ottomans who succeeded, unifying Anatolia over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and advancing to the Danube. Unfortunately, their origins are obscured by the present state of the evidence and the relative care taken by their early chroniclers to homogenise the story of their rise to power. As scholars have examined the sources in greater depth and sought out neglected or new sources, it seems that in some ways they are less sure today than was the case a generation ago. What follows is surely partly true but not very likely the whole truth.²³

One of the problems facing historians of the earliest Ottoman years is the reconciliation of the Byzantine sources and the Ottoman chronicles. Although some of the material in the chronicles may go back earlier than 1422, it is very hard to test accounts of events dating back to the early fourteenth century. Aşıkpaşazade claims to rely in part on a source whose author lived in Orhan's time, but no other exemplar of this source has surfaced, and the material it retails looks to contain a certain amount of romance. The Byzantine sources are more contemporary, and it is convenient to attempt a reconciliation on the grounds that what seemed significant to one author would have found agreement from another. But this need not be true, and some of the attempts at fitting Byzantine and Ottoman accounts together have failed under closer scrutiny. So we face the interesting challenge of balancing two accounts that are occasionally rather distant from each other.

A second problem arises from the nature of the early Ottoman chronicles, which, it is now clear, contain a fair amount of folk tradition. If this is so, then at what point may we begin to take these chronicles seriously?²⁴ A conservative view would place this time in the middle of Orhan's reign. In the reconstruction

22 See Howard Crane, 'Notes on Architecture and Patronage in Beylik Anatolia (1300–1450)', in *The Turks*, vol. II, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca (Ankara, 2002), pp. 737–45.

23 I am deeply indebted, in what follows, to the excellent chronological account of Imber, *Ottoman Empire*.

24 See Colin Imber, 'The Legend of Osman Gazi', in Zachariadou, *The Ottoman Emirate*, pp. 67–75.

below, however, a more liberal attitude will reign, tempered by a certain humility.

How should this history be organised? This chapter will follow a tradition honoured by time and discuss the events and processes reign by reign. We have no means at present of retrieving the personalities of the early Ottoman rulers, but at the same time it does not appear that the events were more in the hands of administrators or persons whose judgement ran independently of the wish of the chief (and, later, sultan). There is some evidence that there are some changes in policy due to the character of a new sultan, but it would be imprudent to make a wholesale claim in this regard. For the moment, until one sees the development of a solid institutional base or countervailing forces away from the centre of the enterprise, it seems safe to organise the history by the reigns of the heads of the enterprise.

The forefathers of the Ottomans appear to have entered Anatolia either just before, with or immediately after the Mongol incursions of the 1240s and 1250s. Ottoman tradition had Osman's father, Ertuğrul, like so many founders of later beyliks, arrive in the frontier zone between the weakened Seljuk polity and the weakening Byzantine Empire. In particular, the nomads and other followers in what may well have been a tribally organised group enjoyed pastures and cultivable lands between Eskişehir (Dorylaion) and what is now Bilecik, at a place now called Söğüt (probably an ancient settlement, given that spolia have been found in the area, but its ancient name is not confirmed). We know nothing about the life of Ertuğrul, and his existence is independently attested only by a coin of his son Osman.

Ottoman history begins with this Osman, about whom the chronicles weave a tantalising web of tales. It should be noted right at the start that because the contemporary Byzantine chronicler Pachymeres refers to him as Atman, Colin Heywood has reasonably suggested that he had some relation to the Mongols north and north-west of the Byzantines, and that Pachymeres had 'hetman' in mind. Osman's career is one of conquest, moving to secure his rear against the beys of Germiyan, defending himself against Mongols to the south-east, and advancing slowly to the west and north-west down the Sakarya (Sangarios) river, towards the 'Bithynian Riviera'.

The early Ottoman chronicles indicate that Osman began to act independently of the Seljuks around 1299. It is far from clear that Seljuk authority ran north-west as far as the frontier of Phrygia and Bithynia, but it does seem clear that the Ilkhanid authority came pretty close, at least sporadically. There is a silver *dirhem* at Tübingen minted in the name of the Ilkhan Ghazan, dated 699, with the mint Söğüt (modern Söğüt). During that year some forty-six

mints struck silver *dirhems* in Anatolia, a record, as mentioned previously. It is possible that there is a relationship between this *annus mirabilis* and the revolt of the Ilkhanid governor Sülemiş, but in any case the implication is that in 699 whoever held authority at Söğüt was beholden to the Ilkhan. And there is later evidence from an accounting treatise that in Orhan's time the Mongols expected his tribute. So it would not be outlandish to expect to find Osman within the Ilkhanid orbit at the beginning of his public career.

Our first indisputable evidence comes from the Byzantine chronicler Pachymeres, who tells the story of a battle at Bapheus, quite near Nicomedia (İzmit), in July 1302, in which Osman and a force of nomad archers defeated a Byzantine force accompanied by Alan auxiliaries. It is possible that bad weather upstream and a rare flood of the Sakarya (Sangarios) downstream made it attractive to Osman and other Turkish beys to seek to recoup damage to their herds in the lowlands. At this time Osman was no more powerful than a number of other minor beys south and east of the Sakarya basin.

However, over the course of the succeeding decade Osman took control of lands west of the Sakarya and well into the Bursa plain. He was unable to seize any of the cities, but he extended his influence over the small communities without much opposition from Constantinople. At the time of his death, probably in 1324, he had yet to obtain control of a city, although he was master of much of the lowland areas outside of İznik (Nicaea) and Bursa (Prusa). It should be noted that in the 1290s there was little reason for the Byzantines to take much notice of him, and membership in the bands of the nomad chiefs was still fluid, depending on their successes. A good deal of Osman's success in the Bithynian lowlands derives from the fact that the Byzantines had relaxed their defences and had a very small army available for service in Anatolia. As for Osman's own success, there is some evidence from *vakıf* documents and registers. These make it clear that many of his foundations were located in the southern, less economically productive area of his domains: in fact, the resources available to him, if the foundations are any measure, were limited and by no means the equal of his neighbouring beys.²⁵

What was the economic adaptation of the Ottomans in Osman's time? It looks as if the military force available to Osman was nomadic, that is, it was a body of mounted archers. There is no evidence of the availability of siege engines for İznik or Bursa. Nor is there much evidence of the need for an independent coinage, although the same could be said of the beyliks to the

25 See the very suggestive study by Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'La conquête de la Bithynie maritime, étape décisive dans la fondation de l'état ottoman,' in *Byzanz als Raum*, ed. Klaus Belke, Fridrich Bild, Johannes Koder and Peter Soustal (Vienna, 2000), pp. 21–35.

south and north-east. Aşıkpaşazade writes of Osman's having fostered the growth of a town, Yenişehir, in the plain not far from Bursa, but this site is also an ancient foundation, and it is not clear that the occupation means the wholesale adoption of sedentary ways. It looks as though Osman was a nomad chief making his fortune, after the early 1300s, in an area of agrarian wealth. The early Ottoman advance, and this was true for many years, seems to have been based upon the discovery that the rewards of expansion substantially exceeded the costs incurred. Osman was master of the countryside but had yet to adopt urban ways.

What was the religious orientation of the earliest Ottoman beylik? Although the early Ottoman chronicles occasionally retail stories that have the bouquet of heterodoxy about them, the purpose of these folktales is at least in part to connect the Ottomans with a particular location rather than to suggest a dubious orthodoxy. Many of the settled subjects of Osman were Christians; many of his nomads were Muslims whose self-definition in religious terms probably varied from those definitions of urban Muslims in the hinterland; and as for the ruling family itself, the creation of *vakıfs* close to Söğüt implies that orthodox Sunni scholars were available, as well as Sufis and, perhaps, wandering specialists in comparative religion.²⁶

There is nothing to be identified with certainty as Ottoman art at this early stage. Architectural remains in many of the other beyliks survive from at least a generation before the first Ottoman building that we may still study, a mosque in İznik founded in 1333.

In terms of administration, there is also little to be said. A surviving *vakıf* document, drawn up for Orhan in 1324 and concerning the foundation of a hospice for dervishes in Mekece, in the lower Sakarya basin, indicates that there were scholars available and able to compose documents in Persian.²⁷ The earliest inscriptions indicate the presence of scholars competent in Arabic, and when Ibn Battuta passed through the area in 1331 he referred to a few scholars who had come to the area from the south and east. There is little more to help us out before the time of Orhan.

The sources for the career of Osman's son Orhan (r. c. 1324–62) are somewhat better. As noted before, there are gaps in the chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade, but the Byzantine sources provide fuller information about this more threatening neighbour, and European sources begin to notice the Ottoman beylik. It is also possible to discern a number of processes that begin during Orhan's lengthy

²⁶ I owe this expression to Professor Jacob Lassner.

²⁷ A good statement of the significance of such foundations appears in Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream* (New York, 2006), p. 9.

reign. First, an administration takes root, for which we have the physical evidence of an independent coinage, with a sophisticated design. Second, the military arm of the beylik turns to sedentary modes of warfare, with an infantry wing. Third, there is a military advance into the Balkans. Fourth, religious institutions and a corresponding architectural tradition take firm root. Fifth, there is evidence of a symbiosis between Christian and Muslim. Finally, there is an economic expansion corresponding to the military advance, and this follows upon the conquest of the major Bithynian cities during the first dozen years or so of Orhan's rule. Not all, or even most, of these processes were planned in advance, but they reflect a shrewd opportunistic character shared by many persons of influence.

When Orhan came to power Bursa had already been paying tribute to the Ottomans for at least fifteen years, and the city languished under blockade. In April 1326 Bursa surrendered; within a year Orhan had established a mint and struck *dirhems* there. A year later, an earthquake made possible the seizure of Ulubad. By 1329, pastoralists were grazing their flocks on the hills above the coastal communities on the northern coast of the Gulf of İzmit.

The Byzantine emperor, Andronikos III, decided to do what he could to prevent the encirclement of İzmit. In June 1329, he led an army along the coast road in the hope of beating the Ottomans to the high ground. When the soldiers arrived at Pelekanon, south-west of Gebze, they found the Ottoman cavalry awaiting them on the high ground. For much of the day the Ottomans attempted, in the fashion of steppe warfare, to ride down and wear out the Byzantines with their storms of arrows, but this failed. It was only after the chance wounding of the emperor, which led to a frenzied retreat of the soldiers to the coastal keeps, that the Ottomans were able to win the day. The story of this battle, which appears *in extenso* in the chronicle of Kantakouzenos, is more of a Byzantine defeat than of an Ottoman victory. It tells us that, even commanding the high ground, the Ottomans were unable to dislodge the Byzantine line of defence: which means that the Ottomans did not have enough nomads. Given that the Bithynian lowlands were used for cultivation rather than pasture, and that the pastures east of and above the Sakarya basin were not yet in Ottoman hands, the lack of sufficient nomadic strength is understandable. And so is the consequent Ottoman development of an infantry wing: the new circumstances of city and country life, begun by Osman and continued by Orhan, led in due course to a sedentarisation of Ottoman military thought and practice.

On the Byzantine side, the 1329 campaign of Andronikos was his last attempt to dislodge the Ottomans from Bithynia. In due course the remaining cities

capitulated. In 1331 İzmit became an Ottoman possession. When Ibn Battuta arrived a few months later, he noted the dilapidated condition of the city, which must have proved an instructive contrast to Bursa, which he found prosperous and attractive. By 1337, despite Byzantine tribute paid to protect it, İzmit was in Ottoman hands.

Some time after this, the Ottomans annexed the beylik of Karası, but the story is obscure. It is possible that family disputes hastened the fall of the independent polity, which may be dated as late as 1346. There are also indications that some of the leading figures in the beylik were in favour of adopting an Ottoman overlord, perhaps in order to increase their opportunities in Thrace.²⁸ Beyond this, at some point Orhan turned his attention to the east, for in the 1330s Ibn Battuta found Göynük and neighbouring towns under Ottoman control, with Ankara added perhaps twenty years later. This expansion, the details of which are presently denied us, reflects the collapse of Mongol authority in Galatia in the last years of the Ilkhanid Abu Sa'id as well as the inability of the Germiyanids, who had once threatened Eskişehir, to control the lands east of Phrygia.

The Ottoman entry into Balkan history began during Orhan's reign. In a history of Turkey it is unclear just how much emphasis should be placed on the internal history of the Balkans, but the topic cannot be ignored, since so much that transpired in Anatolia had close connections with developments across the straits. So perhaps it is best to rest upon the convention of the older diplomatic histories and recount part of the story of 'Turkey in Europe'.

In retrospect, it is difficult to understand why a Byzantine leader would call upon a Turkish leader for troops to assist in Balkan campaigns. Although the Byzantines had paid tribute to Orhan in the 1330s in order to protect the northern coast of the Gulf of İzmit and the city of İzmit itself, the Ottomans seized the city in 1337. It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that the internecine quarrels over the Byzantine throne seemed more important than the preservation of Byzantine control in the countryside, and that the dynastic contenders were short sighted. Perhaps, instead, the willingness to enlist Turkish auxiliaries represents only a continuation of a practice that went back centuries in Byzantine annals, and that those who brought them in felt that their utility more than made up for the possibility that they would remain, unite and appropriate the land. It may be offered that some of the Turkish formations were tribal and fluid, willing to change allegiance when a chief faltered, and

28 Cf. Zachariadou, 'Karasi', a valiant attempt to solve the thorny problems arising from the sources that mention this beylik.

that possibility may have assumed primacy of place in the rulers' strategic planning.

In 1329, at Pelekanon, John Kantakouzenos fought against Orhan and his army. In 1346 the two became allies and in-laws. For the previous five years Kantakouzenos had been disputing, from Thrace, the party of the young John V Palaeologos in Constantinople. Both sides sought troops from Orhan, and Kantakouzenos won; in 1346 Orhan married a daughter of Kantakouzenos, who was able to enter the capital a year later. On three further occasions Kantakouzenos called for Ottoman assistance, and Orhan responded. During these campaigns, in which a certain amount of freebooting accompanied the planned evolutions, Orhan's forces learned about the landscape, the resources and the capacities of the opposing forces. We should bear in mind that there had already been forces from the other beyliks campaigning in the Balkans, especially from Umur Bey of Aydın. Some of these forces later came under Ottoman control, and their earlier independence is not clear from the Ottoman chronicles alone.

At this point nature intervened. In March 1354, an earthquake levelled some of the walls of Gallipoli (Gelibolu) and other neighbouring communities. Orhan's son Süleyman Paşa, who had earlier occupied for a time a fortification in Thrace, returned from Anatolia, occupied Gallipoli and fortified it as well as other positions.²⁹ Gallipoli proved a strategic locus, from which raiders were able to harass, and occupy, Thracian lands. Süleyman Paşa died in 1357, but not before entering Ottoman annals as a figure of heroic proportions.³⁰

The record of the Ottoman advance in Thrace is obscure, and it appears to have had a caesura for a few years after 1357 when one of Orhan's sons, Halil, was captured and imprisoned in Phocaea (Foça). The Byzantines ultimately ransomed him and, after arranging another marriage alliance, this time between Halil and the emperor's daughter, returned him in the hope of buying peace. This did not last, although there seems little evidence of Orhan's intervention in Europe during Halil's captivity. By Orhan's death in 1362, however, the city of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka) in Thrace had recently fallen to Turkish forces.

During the latter part of Orhan's reign, he became at least a temporary ally of Genoa against Venice (1352). This event suggests that, along with Aydın

29 On the earlier occupation, see Nicolas Oikonomides, 'From Soldiers of Fortune to Gazi Warriors: the Tzympe Affair', in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. Colin J. Heywood and Colin Imber (Istanbul, 1994), pp. 239–48.

30 Although he is famous for his remembered exploits in Thrace, he also soldiered in Paphlagonia and Galatia, where he occupied Gerece and Ankara. One should also note the large number of buildings associated with him in Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mi'marisinin İlk Devri 630–805 (1230–1402)* (Istanbul, 1966).

and Menteşe, the Ottoman beylik had assumed a larger role and was not only a menace to Constantinople but also a Mediterranean presence, despite its lack of a fearsome navy (although by this time the Ottomans had inherited the navy of Karası). And if we look at the architecture of Orhan's era and the records of pious foundations, we see a development in the direction of greater sophistication and greater resources (away from the plateau and more firmly planted in the rich Bithynian lowlands). If Orhan had begun his independent career as a nomad chief, he ended it as a sedentary statesman, on an equal footing with the Byzantine leaders and a potential ally with whom to reckon carefully.

The year 1354 is not only the date of a definitive Ottoman advance into Thrace but also the year in which the theologian Gregory Palamas found himself in Ottoman captivity for some weeks. Palamas's account is a precious record of a cosmopolitan moment in at least one part of Asia Minor. We learn of serious interfaith discussions (in which Palamas was a master, as his teachings on Byzantine theology demonstrate), of Graecophone employees enjoying Orhan's confidence, and perhaps of the process of symbiosis en route to full conversion.³¹

The economic basis of Orhan's beylik was broader and probably wealthier than had been the case in Osman's time. The coinage that we can attribute to Osman seems occasional and is certainly rare. Orhan's coinage has at least three types, one of which seems to hark back to a well-attested and frequently found Rum Seljuk issue; and while infrequent, his issues may be found in most major collections.

There is also a fair amount of construction in Orhan's time, including not only mosques but also *medreses*: that is, Orhan's religious advisers were establishing means of replicating themselves without the need of importing talent. When İznik fell to the Ottomans, mosques and *medreses* (the Hacı Özbek mosque and the first Ottoman *medrese* of 1331, the same year in which Ibn Battuta compared the newly conquered city unfavourably with Bursa) soon joined the older Byzantine structures. In Bursa, the Orhan Bey mosque (1339) shows features of Byzantine construction, so that the edifice has a style that may be termed, in the usage of Clive Foss, 'Byzlamic'.

At this point it is useful to address an issue that has troubled specialists for quite some time, the origins of the janissary corps and the introduction of the *devşirme*, the enslavement of Christian children, who were trained for careers

³¹ Anna Philippides-Braat, 'La captivité de Palamas chez les Turcs, dossier et commentaire,' *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979), 109–221.

in either the military or government. The origins of these institutions are also enmeshed in the question of the origins and development of an Ottoman infantry corps. Did these originate during the reign of Orhan or Murad I? Recent research indicates that existing chronicle accounts of the origins of the infantry corps are based upon questionable grounds, which makes it more difficult to place the janissaries and *devşirme* before the reign of Murad. If, as now seems likely, we place these latter in Murad's reign, it is still difficult to establish a precise date for the introduction of either. They were certainly in existence by the heyday of Bayezid I, but further research in the archives will be needed to narrow the list of possibilities to particular years in the 1370s and 1380s, as well as resolving the order of their creation.³²

In general, our sources for the reign of Murad I (1362–89) improve as the Ottomans attracted more attention from their neighbours in the Balkans, but from the perspective of the Ottoman materials, the chronicles continue to obfuscate when it suits their patrons and victorious perspective. And of course, the European materials are centred on the Balkans, so our knowledge of Anatolian affairs suffers (and thus our treatment of them is shorter). Again, we are at the beginning of our appreciation of the materials available in Turkish archives bearing on this period. For example, we will have cause later to discuss the thorny matter of succession to rule, a topic of concern to all historians of Muslim communities, especially when laying out the bare bones of the aftermath of the battle of Ankara in 1402. However, there is evidence that even earlier the passage from ruler to ruler in the Ottoman domains was not as comfortable as the chronicles suggest, and this is also true of the passage to Murad I, although we have no precise information on the relationships of the offspring of Orhan.³³

By the time Murad cemented his hold on Ottoman rule, the Mongol imperium in central and eastern Anatolia was on the wane. Ankara may have become Eretnid at some point after 1354, but the city was in Ottoman hands by the time Murad died. None of the beyliks, save perhaps Karaman, had the military resources to withstand Ottoman pressure, and the expansion of the Ottomans to the south-east reflects this balance of power. The more populous, more agriculturally diverse and trading beyliks of the south-west coast

32 See the remarkable short study by Colin Imber, 'The Origin of the Janissaries', *Journal of Turkish Studies* 26 (2002), 15–19. See also the very suggestive study by Vassilis Demetriades, 'Some Thoughts on the Origins of the *Devşirme*', in Zachariadou, *The Ottoman Empire*, pp. 23–31.

33 See in general Joseph Fletcher, 'Turco-Mongolian Monarchic Tradition in the Ottoman Empire', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3–4 (1979–80), 236–51.

remained independent for another generation. However, an upland arrow-head of territory, pointed towards Ankara and with sides extending on the west as far as Simav and in the south as far as the coastline between Antalya and Manavgat, became Ottoman during this period. It contained a number of small towns, pasture areas (in the neighbourhood of Sivrihisar), the plateau lakes between Akşehir and Beyşehir, and the old caravan route south from the plateau to the coast.

The beyliks in contention were Germiyan, Hamid, a small part of Karaman and Teke. The northern section of Germiyan, including its capital Kütahya, are said to have come via a marriage alliance, and Hamid by purchase, accounts which the reader may accept with a healthy dose of scepticism. These events may have taken place in the second half of the 1370s; by the mid-1380s, the bey of Karaman raided recently acquired Ottoman lands, which brought Murad back from the Balkans and ended with the acquisition of Beyşehir; and Teke, including Antalya, he annexed immediately afterwards.

There is one aspect of these last Anatolian campaigns that reveals a change in the balance of power. In the first half of the fourteenth century, Byzantines and Balkan lords made use of mercenaries from the Anatolian beyliks. By the end of the 1380s, it was the Ottomans who could call upon their Balkan, Christian dependants to provide them with manpower for their expeditions in Asia Minor. This reservoir of soldiery was further proof that no Anatolian power could withstand the full force of Ottoman power. It also revealed that the Ottomans, on the other hand, might not be able to handle, at the same time, warfare on both the eastern and western land frontiers of their expanding enterprise.

In the Balkans, by the end of his life Murad ruled over an area probably no less in extent and economic capacity than the area he controlled in Anatolia. It is important to realise that not all of these conquests in Europe were closely directed by the sultan (and the coinage of Murad begins to refer to the ruler as sultan). A number of marcher lords, some of whom may have begun their careers as independent freebooters, spread Turkish power and enjoyed a certain independence when, for a few years after 1366, the Byzantines briefly enjoyed control of Gelibolu. They were most likely responsible for the seizure of Edirne (Adrianople) in 1369, and it may be one of them to whom we owe the introduction of what we know as the *devşirme*.³⁴ They played a major role in organising raids and establishing vantage points for further advance.

34 E. A. Zachariadou, 'The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 211–18; Demetriades, 'Some Thoughts'.

Some of them also are responsible for a number of building programmes as well.³⁵ Ultimately, a lord appearing to possess designs of independence was executed (Hacı İlbeği); others became Ottoman servants and were able to create substantial estates as they moved along with the conquest (Evrenos went from Edirne to Komotini to Serres and finally to Yenice on the Vardar).

During the early years of Murad's reign, including the period when the crusade of Amadeo of Savoy had placed Gelibolu back in Byzantine hands, Turkish forces moved west and north, reaching as far as Filibe (Philippopolis, modern Plovdiv) along the Maritsa (Meriç). After the battle of the Maritsa near Çirmen (1371) the Turks were able to consolidate their power radiating west and north of Edirne. During the early 1370s, Murad was able to cross the Rhodope mountains and advance to the Struma. Finally, by the end of the 1380s, one prong of Ottoman power had reached Monastir and Ohrid to the west, while another had reached Niş (Niš), and the campaign of 1389, advancing in between these two, had reached Kosovo. These conquests were far more rapid than the Ottoman advance to the south and east in Anatolia, and the speed of the advance may explain the survival of many Balkan institutions.³⁶ It is useful to speculate that these Ottoman advances may have been due in part to the willingness of one or another participant in Balkan rivalries to support the Turks.³⁷

There remains some confusion over the chronology and order of the Ottoman advance into the Balkans during Murad's career.³⁸ After the fall of Edirne, an alliance of Serb rulers led to battle near the Maritsa in 1371. The Turks were victorious, and Edirne became a base for advances to the north and west. No later than 1376 Murad, thanks to successful interference in Byzantine affairs, was back in full control of Gelibolu. By 1380, he controlled the area of Bulgaria south of the Balkan mountains directly; the area to the north, as far as the Danube, may have owed the Ottomans service thanks to a marriage alliance. A campaign in 1388 established a clear subservience of the Bulgarian polity.

35 For a projection of their power back into Ottoman antiquity, see Theodore Spandounes, *On the Origin of the Ottoman Emperors*, trans. Donald M. Nicol (Cambridge, 1997), p. 15.

36 For a broader perspective linking the importance of trade routes in both peninsulas, see E. A. Zachariadou, 'From Avlona to Antalya: Reviewing the Ottoman Military Operations of the 1380s', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380–1699)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1996), pp. 227–32.

37 I owe this thought to the article 'Murad I' in *El2*, vii, pp. 392–4, by J. H. Kramers.

38 Here I follow, with gratitude, Imber's *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 28–36. Further details on the later chronology are in Stephen W. Reinert, 'From Niš to Kosovo Polje, Reflections on Murad I's Final Years', in Zachariadou, *The Ottoman Emirate*, pp. 169–211.

The reader will note that there is some lack of clarity concerning the precise time when the Ottomans were again able to cross to Europe via Gelibolu. Thus, it is difficult to argue that an early advance was 'Ottoman' as opposed to 'Turkish' or due to the initiative of a marcher lord on a loose tether. We understand that at this time Murad had a governor appointed over his European domains, Lala Şahin, who also appears in the chronicle record, as well as a *vezir*, Çandarlı Halil. However, the lord Evrenos moved across Thrace in the late 1360s. Turkish threats against Thessalonike (Selanik), beginning already in 1372, led to renewed European diplomacy; the advance also may have fuelled rivalries at the Byzantine court, where a civil war broke out, lasting for most of the decade. At its conclusion, the Byzantines found themselves forced to provide service to the Ottomans. Byzantium was now another beylik.

To the west and south, raids continued into the 1380s, taking advantage of discord within the Byzantine ruling family and the rivalries of Balkan princes. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a series of raids and a campaign of conquest, and it is also difficult to distinguish between military exploits planned and directed from the sultan's court at Edirne and the opportunistic adventures of the men in the field. By 1386, Albania had become a target of opportunity, parts of Macedonia had come under Ottoman suzerainty and, closer to home, Sofia had become Ottoman. In 1387 Thessalonike fell to an Ottoman siege, despite a years'-long defence. By 1388 the commercial entrepôts of Genoa and Venice had established rights in the growing Ottoman territories. The marcher lord Evrenos had, after raiding to the west, turned south on behalf of a Byzantine lord and brought his troops against Latin possessions.

By this time, Turkish raids and Ottoman occupation of cities stretching west and north-west had come close to flanking the lands of the Serbian rulers on their east and south. In 1387 the forces of Prince Lazar defeated an Ottoman army. Just how and why this occurred is not clear; a year after a campaign in Anatolia against Karaman, it is possible that the Ottoman forces were not at their best. But the same happened in 1388, when Turkish forces fought against the Bosnian king.

All this was prelude to the 1389 campaign in which Murad's and Lazar's forces met at Kosovo, with both rulers losing their lives after a prolonged and bloody battle, of which the memory, real and imagined, has resonated down through the centuries in Balkan emotions. The key point to bear in mind here is that, whereas the sacrifices of the Serb and Albanian forces may have stemmed the Turkish tide momentarily, the resources of the Ottomans, their organisation, their ability to project 'official' and 'unofficial' forces in more than one theatre at a time, all kept the balance of power firmly in Ottoman hands.

In this overview of Murad's generation, the military account has, as usual, taken pride of place, in large part because the literary sources emphasise such deeds. And there were important military developments, of course: the janissary corps, the adoption and spread of techniques of siege warfare, used time and again on Balkan campaigns, and the establishment of a system of revenue allotments, *timars*, to fund an army of mounted warriors more reliable than nomads (and the existence of these revenue allotments implies the establishment of registers of revenue sources). There is, thus, little doubt that during his reign an Ottoman administrative style began to develop, with less reliance upon Seljuk tradition, Mongol practice, Byzantine influence or nomadic custom. In terms of artistic patronage, Anatolia is still the centre, at least in terms of surviving, larger structures, such as the mosques Murad established in Bursa (e.g. Hüdavendigar Camii, 1385). In religious developments, by the end of Murad's reign the *medreses* that first appear in Orhan's years have provided nearly two generations' worth of graduates, and the number of religious scholars who appear to have been émigrés seems smaller. The Ottomans, in 1389, were a power on two continents, against whom no immediate neighbour could stand with equal forces or resources. Murad assumed the leadership of a beylik; he left behind an imperial enterprise.

Murad's successor, Bayezid I (1389–1402), became sultan on the battlefield of Kosovo. He is known as Yıldırım, 'the thunderbolt', thanks to a reputation for quick resolve. He removed himself and his forces from the field immediately in order to respond to attempts at greater independence from the beys of Germiyan, Karaman and the post-Mongol ruler of eastern Anatolia, Kadı Burhaneddin of Sivas. He took along with him Serb and Byzantine auxiliaries, while some of his forces remained behind and seized Skoplje (Üsküp) in 1391. It would be interesting to know how the leaders of the Anatolian beyliks kept in touch with Ottoman progress in the Balkans and how their strategies reflected such knowledge.

We do not know the strategic thought behind Bayezid's campaign in western Anatolia, but it is possible to see it in part as an attempt to gain full control of outlets to the Aegean (and a larger navy) as well as a project to protect his right flank. His forces seized the last Byzantine outpost in the peninsula, Philadelphia (Alaşehir), and then the coastal principalities, and brought Germiyan completely to heel.³⁹ Fighting against the Karamanids on the plateau

39 For the interesting example of Philadelphia/Alaşehir see Peter Schreiner, 'Zur Geschichte Philadelphias im 14. Jahrhundert (1293–1390)', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), 375–431; and *Philadelphie et autres études* (Paris, 1984). The sole coastal outpost to remain outside Bayezid's grasp was İzmir, in the hands of the crusader knights of Rhodes.

while repelling raids from Kadı Burhaneddin and his allies in the north proved difficult. Bayezid was unable to bring his siege of Konya to a successful conclusion, and in the north he was unable to move beyond Amasya.

Bayezid had little to fear from Byzantium as a military force, but diplomatic overtures to European powers, and especially Venice, led him to begin, in 1394, the first blockade of Constantinople; ultimately, after 1396, the Muslims resident in the city had their own judge, thanks to his pressure. The efforts of his marcher lords in the Balkans brought some success, and in early 1394 Bayezid gathered his subordinate Balkan Christian lords together at Serres, where he sought to bring them under closer Ottoman domination. Some of them turned to Venice, and this led Ottoman forces south, into Greece as far as the Morea. In 1395 Bayezid campaigned in Hungary and parts of Romania, returning via Bulgaria.

In 1396 a force of European and east European knights set forth on crusade against Bayezid. They met his army at Nikopolis and were crushed.⁴⁰ This was a battle between two different conceptions of warfare: a European tradition featuring the mounted charger, and an infantry army closely dug in and difficult to dislodge by techniques of the feudal era. The ransom of captives brought the kingdom of France and the Ottomans into diplomatic contact for the first time.⁴¹

The failure of European assistance in 1396 strengthened Bayezid's hand vis-à-vis his enemies, who could not count on diversions from the west in their aid. In the following year Bayezid was finally able to seize Konya and the Karamanid domains, and in 1398 the lands of Kadı Burhaneddin. This in turn brought a riposte from Timur, who claimed to speak on behalf of the leaders of the former beyliks; Bayezid, on his part, opposed the Inner Asian leader's claims to leadership. Timur had at his disposal not only the older argument for Mongol world domination; he could also claim to protect the Muslim beyliks against Bayezid's aggressive demands. The battle between their armies at Ankara in 1402 was very different from that at Nikopolis, and in a sense it harked back to the old argument over Mongol numbers versus Mamluk training. Bayezid had at his disposal a core army of janissaries, but they were unequal in numbers to the task. The result, however, was momentarily devastating to the Ottoman cause, as Bayezid's forces could not surmount Timur's army, and the sultan

40 The older account of Aziz S. Atiya, *The Crusade of Nicopolis* (London, 1934), may be supplemented by David Nicolle, *Nicopolis 1396* (Oxford, 1999).

41 As noted by Nicolas Vatin in Robert Mantran (ed.), *Histoire de l'empire ottoman* (Paris, 1989), p. 52.

was taken captive. The Ottoman enterprise in Anatolia, as established (but not firmly) over the previous decade by Bayezid, foundered.⁴²

This is not to say that the story of Bayezid is the story of hubris finding its true reward, of a Turkish Croesus discovering that if he crossed the line, the great empire that fell would be his. Perhaps too much attention is paid to the military aspect of his reign. The largest architectural monument of his reign is the complex now called Anadolu Hisarı, built where the Bosphorus narrows and designed to assist in the siege of Constantinople; however, his builders also constructed a complex in Bursa, and most of the construction attributed to his reign is in Anatolia, with a number of buildings in the Balkans associated with the marcher lords. We also learn that Bayezid, perhaps as part of his rivalry with Timur, sought the title ‘Sultan of Rum’. There is also a slight hint that in the aftermath of Nikopolis at least one text recounting the deeds of the Ottoman dynasty was in the process of composition, a witness to the beginning of a historical self-consciousness that came to fruition a generation later. Bayezid reigned for too short a time, and too short a time in one place, for us to gather a clear idea of the artistic patronage he displayed.

The following twenty years are amongst the most confused in the history of the establishment of Ottoman power. There are not only the usual questions concerning evaluation of sources and the concordance of discordant traditions. There is also the problem of understanding the motivations behind the actions of the major political players. It seems fair at this remove to offer the judgement that the actions of Bayezid’s sons rested upon rapid calculations, short-sighted motives and a lack of evidence sufficient to justify rational choices (it is of course not at all clear that a ‘rational choice’ model comes anywhere near close to representing the course of events). The historian is left with the consuming desire to bring order out of chaos, and the preceding pages have reflected a decision to outline rather than to provide full detail, but in the treatment of this era it may be fairer to provide the reader with a sense of the significance of the contingent in the reconstruction of the polity Bayezid had expanded so rapidly. One key to forcing an understanding, however blunt, of the situation is to note that once a leader had won a temporarily superior position, he did not rest; rather than recoup their strengths and let the gelatin of their good fortune harden, they often pressed on, to their ultimate disadvantage.

It is also important to bear in mind that, during this period, the institutional structure of the enterprises continued, if suffering from fits and starts. In

⁴² See the reprint, with additions, of Marie-Mathilde Alexandru-Dersca, *La campagne de Timur en Anatolie* (London, 1982).

Anatolia, of course, the campaign of Timur and his raiding after the battle of Ankara – on top of which we must place his dismemberment of the acquisitions of Bayezid and the reconstitution of the beyliks – brought the establishment of a unified administrative practice to a two-decades-long halt.⁴³ However, the Ottoman practices remained in recollection, and the later Ottoman rule did not have to be installed *de novo*.

Bayezid left behind four sons: Süleyman, Mehmed, İsa and Musa. Süleyman managed to outrun the Timurid troops and cross, with Genoese assistance, to the Balkans. Before departing the peninsula, Timur confirmed Süleyman as ruler of the Balkan Ottoman territories, İsa at Bursa and Mehmed in the east, master of Amasya and Tokat. Musa he kept with him for a time. He also confirmed those fugitive beys who had submitted to him in their former beyliks, with Karaman the biggest winner in terms of recovered territory.

In order to preserve his position in the Balkans, Süleyman treated with his Christian neighbours and an accord resulted in 1403 at Gelibolu. The naval powers received exemptions from various exactions, the Genoese received concessions, and the Byzantines recovered Thessalonike and considerable freedom of action, and were able to expel the Turkish fifth column from Constantinople. For the moment, it appeared that Süleyman was the leading heir of Bayezid's legacy, and in fact the earliest version of a text containing an Ottoman chronicle, the *İskendernâme* of Ahmedi, is dedicated to him.

İsa had been established at Bursa, although without many resources: Süleyman had taken the remains of the treasury with him en route to Europe. Defeated by his brother Mehmed, İsa took refuge at Constantinople and ultimately joined an alliance of beys against Mehmed. Mehmed, however, managed to defeat this new group of enemies, most of whom were from the coastal beyliks, and İsa fell from view in the aftermath. He had found himself unable to gather support around him and had to go along with the coalition of the moment.

It appeared now that Mehmed had succeeded in re-establishing Ottoman power in north-east and western Anatolia. However, now that İsa was no longer in the picture, Süleyman decided to test his strength in Anatolia. He crossed the straits and appeared to gain strength, especially with those who feared the growth of Mehmed's power and preferred a ruler whose interests lay in another continent. Mehmed retreated east, but he had a card still to play.

We last saw Musa as Timur's prisoner. After Bayezid died in 1402, Musa was permitted to return to Bursa, which placed him within Mehmed's orbit. In

43 Among Timur's feats of horror was to drive the Hospitallers of Rhodes from İzmir.

1409, Mehmed sent him to Wallachia, where he gathered an army of Christian opponents to Süleyman and took to the field. Süleyman, desperate to protect his home base, returned to Europe and allied himself with the Byzantine emperor, Manuel II, a sign of the Ottoman's weakness. In 1411 Musa managed to surprise Süleyman and have him killed. Now Musa, formerly at the will of the wind, found himself the inheritor of a potentially superior position.

At this point, Musa's former allies of convenience found good reason to reassess their sworn loyalties. He besieged Thessalonike and the suburbs of Constantinople. Unsuccessful, he found some of his own followers seeking a more promising arrangement with his brother. Mehmed crossed the straits twice, and in 1413 his army, reinforced with local allies, defeated Musa. Mehmed was now sole ruler (1413–21). It is said that Musa had angered some of his own supporters by his need for funds. If this is so, then we can see how poorly constructed was the bond between potential ruler and local lord during this period of kaleidoscopic change.

Timur had long since died, planning a campaign against China, and the Ottoman sultan was now very much the power with which to reckon. No single Balkan power was able to withstand the Ottoman ruler. Mehmed's base had been in Anatolia, and he sought to guarantee its security first and foremost. A year after defeating Musa he campaigned in Anatolia, securing the loyalty of the western beyliks and bringing to an end a beylik established in Ephesus by a certain Cüneyd. This left Karaman, whose bey had besieged Bursa and razed much of it. By the end of 1415 Karaman had largely submitted, and Bayezid's legacy was reconstituted.

It was at this time that there appeared a man claiming to be Mehmed's older brother, Mustafa, who had been taken off to Samarkand by Timur. Mustafa joined Cüneyd, who, in return for his surrender at İzmir, had been granted the governorship of Nikopolis. The two were finally penned up in Thessalonike in 1416, and Manuel II committed to keeping them under arrest. After this, the Ottomans were able to turn against Karaman in 1417 and bring its bey to heel. Shortly thereafter Ottoman forces raided the lands of the Wallachian and Hungarian rulers, obtaining tribute from the former. The last few years of Mehmed's reign seem to have been consumed by illness and his diplomacy to prevent Mustafa from contesting the succession with Mehmed's chosen successor, his son Murad.

Before turning to the long reign of Murad II, we need to go back and consider events of a different sort, perhaps representing a response to the destruction, warfare, uncertainty and insecurity of the decade after the battle of Ankara in 1402. These events are concerned with the career of a certain Şeyh

Bedreddin.⁴⁴ Bedreddin's father was *kadı* of a town near Edirne, his mother a convert from a family of Byzantine officials. It is possible that on his father's side he was descended from a *vezir* of the Seljuks of Rum. Bedreddin had become a student of theology and, after becoming proficient in law and theology, went to Cairo, where he became an adept of Sufi thought. He seems to have attracted attention from both the great and the humble. Although a number of his theological works are within the confines of the acceptable, he seems also to have been influenced by the more syncretistic and ecstatic dervishes whom he met. It is also said that he was influenced by Christian priests and monks whom he attracted to Islam. At any event, in 1411, Musa made him chief judge of his domains; when Mehmed replaced Musa in 1413, Bedreddin was sent to İznik, the early centre of Ottoman theological thought.

In 1416 Bedreddin left İznik for Wallachia, and in south-west Anatolia, a dervish known as Börklüce Mustafa, who may have been in contact with Bedreddin, raised the flag of revolt. We know the doctrines, which may not be identical, of these two from their enemies, and so some of what is reported may be slander. However, both leaders found themselves in areas that had been ravaged by war and were damaged by expectations denied, on the one hand in the wake of Timur's invasion, and on the other by the decade of war followed by Mehmed's justice against the followers of Musa. Their doctrines included more than a hint of utopian millenarianism, and both preached to the dispossessed and those who had few expectations of advancement under the new regime. It would be difficult to demonstrate that these movements were based on the sort of social discontent and economic deprivation that we associate with later movements, nor can we speak, given the state of the evidence, of the precise nature of their preachings. It does seem that there was a syncretist appeal as well as the suggestion that the rule of Mehmed was neither just nor appropriate in God's eyes. There can be little doubt that at Mehmed's court, they were seen as dangers that, if united, could ignite something rather larger. Both men were hunted down, arrested and killed. Centuries later, nationalist and Marxist scholars have made much of these men and their supporters.

With Murad II (1421–51) the vistas broaden out: much more survives in the way of archival documentation, including a famous tax register of Albania, and we can see a historical self-consciousness arise. On the one hand, during the early years of Murad II's reign, a Seljuk chronicle was translated into Ottoman

44 Michel Balivet, *Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans Ottomans: vie de Cheikh Bedreddin, le 'Hallaj des Turcs' (1358/59–1416)* (Istanbul, 1995).

Turkish by Yazıcıoğlu Ali, who introduced elements favourable to the Ottoman dynasty into the text and placed the Ottomans in the line of succession to the great Turkic leaders of the past. Beyond this work of editorship, in 1421 there appeared a text that served as the base for later recensions of the *Anonymous Chronicles*. This text served as the groundwork for several later works. It consists of a number of layers, one of which includes a great deal of folklore, another of which reflects the views of the more humble Ottoman partisans, but all of which deal with the deeds of the Ottomans as a well-earned gift from God. Further, at this time the Ottoman court had begun to play with various versions of the family genealogy, with the intent of showing the Ottomans as the heirs of one or another great tradition, in particular that of the Oğuz tribe. We have not yet the great imperial chronicles we find holding the field in the sixteenth century, but we see a number of essays towards the explication and justification of greatness.

Mehmed had arranged for his son Murad to succeed him, but Murad was untried and there were still residues of the discontent that surfaced during Şeyh Bedreddin's revolt. Further, not all the marcher lords were happy with a centralising government that might place restraints on their wish for the greater independence their families had enjoyed in the past. Evrenos himself, patriarch of the marcher lords, is said to have died only in 1417, and his memories of a freebooting past might well have inspired many. In the event, the Byzantine emperor, Manuel II, encouraged two dangerous characters: a man who claimed to be Bayezid's son Mustafa, and Cüneyd, whom we have seen before as ruler of a west Anatolian beylik centred on Aydın. Mustafa was initially quite successful in the Balkans, gaining some marcher lord support. When Mustafa crossed into Anatolia, however, Murad's forces outwitted him, the marcher lords recalled their former loyalty, and the pretender fled. It is said that he was caught and killed in 1422. Cüneyd proved less of a danger, and by the middle of the decade Murad's only Anatolian threat remained the beylik of Karaman, which could be well defended but possessed the means only to raid rather than to conquer. The bey of Karaman took advantage of the Ottomans when they were occupied in the Balkans, but in the end the beylik could not expand permanently, nor, for another forty years, could the Ottomans manage to occupy and hold the town of the plateau enterprise. It was not until 1501 that Ottoman forces were able to bring an end to nomad incursions from the Taurus in the south and to the dreams of their beys. Finally, another Mustafa, this one a younger brother of Murad, attempted to displace Murad in Anatolia, and it is not clear just whence his support stemmed. It proved evanescent, however, and he was captured and killed.

There was little that the Byzantine leadership could now do to deter the Ottomans, and in fact the city of Constantinople remained in Byzantine hands largely on Ottoman sufferance. Diplomacy and, to a lesser extent, tribute were the remaining weapons in the empire's arsenal. In the short run, Murad contented himself with Thessalonike, which finally fell to Ottoman siege in 1430; it had been in Venetian hands for the preceding years. In some sense the beginning of the transformation of Thessalonike provided a foretaste of the reconstruction of Constantinople ordained by Mehmed II a generation later. It was measured, with considerable attention given to the preservation of the existing mercantile arrangements.

On the sea, Venice proved to be every bit as obstinate, making itself far more of a threat than its manpower reserves might indicate. The story of Venetian–Ottoman relations is a remarkable vista of the differences between a land-based and a sea-borne empire. The Venetians needed strategically and economically promising ports, as well as the opportunity to ship and sell wares at a profit. The Ottomans, on the other hand, could benefit from the presence of such a power, as they did from the Genoese, but they were never quite able to make the appropriate mutually agreeable arrangements with the Adriatic power.

In the Balkans, the Ottomans faced a number of land powers, of which the strongest was the kingdom of Hungary. For some years before Murad came to power, the Serbian lord had been a relatively trustworthy ally, but after his death the whole north-west frontier came into question again. The mountainous lands of Albania also proved hard to control, although the existence of an Albanian cadastre demonstrates that the Ottomans were beginning to have firm possession of the lands, and knowledge of their resources.

In 1439 the Council of Ferrara-Florence ended with the union of the Greek and Latin churches – or at least it seemed to, for the majority of Greek Orthodox Christians repudiated the arrangement their emperor had negotiated. For Ottoman history the most important result of the council was a renewed interest in Europe for a crusade against the Turks. What whetted European appetites was a curious and unexpected event: the decision of Murad II to abdicate in favour of his son Mehmed II. Now there had been a fair continuity of policy in the history of the Ottoman dynasty, and perhaps the changes we see between Murad II and Mehmed II reflect a natural difference in generations rather than a sea-change.

Nevertheless, we should bear some things in mind. Many of the senior servants of the enterprise over the generations since Orhan had seen their families grow in influence and power. Murad II's *vezir* came from the family of

Murad I's *vezir*. The marcher lords had been important supports for Ottoman expansion since the late 1350s. There was a tradition of expectations and of standard practice. On the other hand, the *devşirme* had been in operation for perhaps two generations by now, and the utility of the janissary corps was well established. A number of *devşirme* graduates were pressing up to the higher levels of power, and Mehmed II represented their future.

Unfortunately, they all overplayed their hand at the start. As the crusading army, composed in the main of forces from Hungary and Transylvania, advanced, Murad was recalled. The battle was joined (prematurely, as not all the crusader forces were present) near Varna in late 1444 and the Ottomans emerged victorious. And so they did again, when a lesser army, of similar composition, was defeated at Kosovo in 1448.

Murad retired once more, but only briefly, as Mehmed's approach alienated janissaries concerned about possible losses as a result of a planned debasement of the silver *akçe*. This was also a harbinger of policies under consideration during Mehmed's reign.

With the death of Murad II in 1451, what we might call the 'old' Ottoman enterprise came to an end, and what we know as the Ottoman Empire was poised to come into being. The battle at Varna in 1444 in many ways was a medieval battle, turned in the fog of war and the struggle of axes. The Ottoman field battle had yet to enter the gunpowder era; by the time of Çaldıran in 1514 gunpowder weapons had proved decisive. Murad was certainly the most powerful leader in south-east Europe and Anatolia, but in some ways he was constrained by custom, diplomacy and the advice of men to some of whom the sultan was still *primus inter pares*. The Ottoman administration had matured, but manipulation of practices, a full centralisation of law and the development of an active monetary policy stood in the wings still. Ottoman historiography was well in the making, but it had yet to achieve its full teleological flowering. All this was about to come to pass.

The incorporation of the Balkans into the Ottoman Empire, 1353–1453

MACHIEL KIEL

In the existing historiography of the Balkans the Turks are usually represented as those who came last and consequently, when the national states were set up, had to go first. It is therefore important to realise that the contacts between the various Turkic peoples and the Balkans are at least as old as the settlement of the Slavs (sixth–seventh century) or even older. On the following pages the pieces of scattered information at our disposal concerning these groups will be pieced together.

The Szekler, a group of more than half a million people living in the eastern part of Transylvania, trace their origin straight to Attila and his Huns.¹ Kutrigurs and Onogurs (the latter giving their name to the country of Hungary/Ungarn) are evidently of Turkish, or, better, Turkic origin. It was in the sixth century, under the leadership of the Turco-Mongolian Avars, that the Slavs invaded and settled the central and southern Balkans, and pushed on as far as the southern tip of the Peloponnese. The Avars were finally subjugated by Charlemagne and those who were left were assimilated. The Slavs remained. A rather similar fate was met by the Bulgars, a nomadic Turkic people moving in from the Eurasian steppes and, under their huns, setting up a powerful pagan empire (681). The ruins of the han's palace, the pagan temple, the stone walls of the 'Forbidden City', but first and foremost the almost 20 kilometre-long earthen rampart and moat at Pliska in the north-eastern Bulgarian plains, made to protect the entire *ulus* (people, nation) in times of danger, still testify to the size and strength of this early Turkic settlement in the Balkans.² In 865, under their han/tsar, Boris-Michael, they converted to

1 For a survey of the background of the Szekler and the earliest certain data about them see Hansgerd Göckenjan, *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 114–39, which includes a rich bibliography.

2 For Pliska see Nikola Mavrodinov, *Starobălgarsko Izkustvo, Izkustvoto na pŕvoto Bălgarsko Tsarstvo* (Sofia, 1959), p. 309, and the rich bibliography. See also Krăstju Miyatev, *Die mittelalterliche Baukunst in Bulgarien* (Sofia, 1974), esp. pp. 27–69.

Orthodox Christianity, and slowly fused with the Slav agriculturists, the new nation identifying itself by the name of the *Herrenvolk*: Bulgarians, and the country Bulgaria.³ From the tenth to the thirteenth century other large Turkic groups – the Uz, the Pechenegs and the Kıpçak or Cumans – arrived from Eurasia and settled on both sides of the lower Danube, leaving behind them many inscriptions and graffiti written in the runes of the Orkhon-Jenissej type.⁴ After 960 Byzantium was again in control of most of Bulgaria. Large groups of Pechenegs, after having been defeated militarily, were settled in the mountain canton of Moglena (on the border of Greece and the former Yugoslav Macedonia) and in the mountainous south-western corner of Bulgaria. There they still survive as a distinct ethnic group, the Šop. They converted to Christianity, and slowly adopted the Slav-Bulgarian language. In the twelfth century, Anna Komnene mentions other Pecheneg groups, who were settled in the south-eastern Rhodopes, in what later was to become the Ottoman *kaza* of Ortaköy (since 1934, Ivajlovgrad). The oldest preserved Ottoman census and taxation register from 1452/5 mentions in this area a remarkably large number of Turkish toponyms evidently dating back to pre-Ottoman times, descriptive toponyms with a Christian connotation such as Başıkilise and Kara Kilise. Ansbert, the historian of the third crusade, mentions that in 1190 the important

3 For a guide to the rich literature on the early Turkic peoples of the Balkans see György Székely *et al.*, *Turkic-Bulgarian-Hungarian Relations (VIth–XIth Centuries)*, ed. Gy. Káldy-Nagy (Budapest, 1981). On the Turco-Bulgarians see especially the valuable work of Dimitir Dimitrov, *Prabǵgarite po Severnoto i Zapadnoto Černomorie* (Varna, 1987). See also S. Ya. Bayčarov, *Avrupa'nın Eski Türk Runik Abideleri* (Ankara, 1996); J. Németh, 'The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe', *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* [Budapest] 21, 1–2 (1971), 1–52. See also the concise survey of Rechid Safvet Atabinen, *Les apports Turcs dans le peuplement et la civilisation de l'Europe orientale* (Paris and Istanbul, 1951). For the most recent overview of the history of the early Turks see Peter B. Golden, 'The Turks: a Historical Overview', in *Turks: a Journey of a Thousand Years, 600–1600*, ed. David J. Roxburgh (London, 2005), pp. 18–31, with a rich bibliography, pp. 476–89. See also the detailed monograph of István Vásáry, *Cumans and Tatars: Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185–1365* (Cambridge, 2005). The latest Turkish work is Osman Karatay and Bilgehan A. Gökdağ (eds.), *Balkanlar El Kitabı* (Ankara, 2006), especially Muallâ Uydu-Yücel, 'Balkanlar'da Peçenek, Oğuz ve Kumanlar', pp. 184–214.

4 For example, in Basaraba, Garvan, Bisericuta, Isakçe and Maçin in the Romanian Dobruđa, in Sinnicolaul Mare in the Romanian Banat, in the old Bulgarian capital cities of Pliska and Preslav, as in southern Russia in Majačko Gradište near Woronesh, in Novočerkask, and in an old Khazar fortress of Sarkel on the lower Volga. For an overview see Damian P. Bogdan, 'Grăfitele de la Basarabi (Murfatlar)', *Analele de Universităţii C. I. Parhon* [Bucharest] 16 (1961), 31–44; Mehmet Ali Ekrem, 'Romanya'da Keşfedilen Orhun Yazısı Örnekleri', in *Balkanlar'da Türk Mührü*, ed. Osman Fikri Sertkaya, Y. Kocasavaş, E. Çetin and Y. Tiryaki (Istanbul, 1998), pp. 69–75 (with systematic tables of the individual runes and their geographic spread). For the runes in the ex-Soviet Union see S. G. Kliashornyi and D. G. Savinov, *Istoriia Tsentral'noi Azii i pamiatniki runicheskogo pis'ma* (St Petersburg, 2003).

town of Béroè (now Stara Zagora) was defended by 'idolaters and Turks in the service of the Emperor of Constantinople'. In the same year the 'Historia Peregrinorum' mentions Turks as defenders of the strong Thracian town of Didymoteichon, alongside Greeks, Alans and Cumans.⁵ What is more important is that the Ortaköy/Ivajlovgrad villages ('next door' to Didymoteichon) were inhabited by Christians, the greater part being most probably the descendants of the Pecheneg deportees, as was already suggested by Jireček more than a century ago.⁶ Perhaps the most important wave of Turkic people in the Balkans was that of the Kıpçak or Cumans, who must have settled in the eastern Balkans in large numbers. They soon converted to Christianity, and even formed some political units, principalities along the Danube. The north Bulgarian principality of Vidin was ruled by the house of Sratsimir, which was of Cuman origin. In the last quarter of the thirteenth century the principality of Braničevo, now in Serbia, was ruled by the Cuman noblemen Kudelin and Derman. The dynasty of the Terterids ruled Bulgaria (with intervals) from 1279 to 1323, and also the last dynasty of medieval Bulgaria, the house of Šišman, was ruled by a dynasty of Cuman origin. In the last decades of the thirteenth and first decades of the fourteenth century, a semi-independent principality existed south of the Balkan mountains (including the territories of the modern cities of Sliven, Kazanlāk and Karlovo) under the Cuman prince Eltemir, brother of Tsar Georgi Terter. The Cumans were ultimately assimilated into the Slav majority. Place names like the town of Kumanovo in Macedonia and villages such as Kumanite and Kumanov Brod still remind us of this now-vanished Turkic people, as does the personal name Kumanov. Eltemir is still the name of a large village in Danubian Bulgaria. The Ottoman *avariz defters* (registers of levies) of north-eastern Bulgaria (the Varna, Provadija, Balčik and Silistra districts) from the seventeenth and mid-eighteenth century, kept village by village, still contain the names of numerous Christians with evidently Turkic personal names, an indication of how slow the process of assimilation has been.⁷

5 See Vásáry, *Cumans and Tatars*.

6 Constantin Jireček, 'Überreste der Petschenegen und Kumanen sowie über die Völkerschaften der sogenannten Gagauzi und Surguči im heutigen Bulgarien', in *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* (Prague, 1889), pp. 1–3.

7 For Pechenegs and Cumans see the article 'Kumani', in the *Entsiklopedija Bălgarija*, vol. III (Sofia, 1982), p. 650 and vol. V (1986), pp. 213–14 for the 'Pečenezi'; this latter article includes details not found elsewhere. See also Göckenjan, *Hilfsvölker*, pp. 89–114; P. Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas Danube* (Bucharest, 1979); P. B. Golden, 'The Migrations of the Oğuz', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972), 45–84; Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples* (Wiesbaden, 1992); Andras P. Horváth, *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary* (Budapest, 1989). For a succinct overview, René Grousset,

Contacts between the Balkans and Turks coming from Asia Minor date from the mid-thirteenth century. In 1261, the Seljuk sultan İzzeddin Keykavus II lost his throne and fled with a large following to the Byzantine emperor, who in 1262–3 settled them in the Black Sea area from Varna to the estuary of the Danube, the dry steppe country later known as the Dobrudja. The full story is related by Yazıcıoğlu Ali in 1424, in his adaptation of Ibn Bibi's thirteenth-century *Selçukname*. Sultan İzzeddin soon fled to Crimea, where he died much later. His followers remained behind under the leadership of the charismatic dervish Sarı Saltık Dede, whose deeds were recalled by the Arab traveller Ibn Battuta, who in 1331 visited the town of Babadag in northern Dobrudja, where the saint was buried. After the death of their great leader (in 1297–8, according to the contemporary Saradj) some of the Turks returned to Anatolia and settled in what then had just become the emirate of Karası, while others remained, and entered converted to Orthodox Christianity Byzantine service. Under their leaders, the Despot Balık, Culpan, Balık's son Dobrotić and grandson Ivanko, they maintained their political independence from Bulgaria as the principality of Dobrudja, which existed from the 1330s till the final annexation by the Ottomans under Mehmed I in 1417. As a people they became known as Gagauz, a corruption of Kaykavus. The name of the province, Dobrudja, derives from Dobrotić. Already in the 1260s the Byzantines started to fear the power of these Turks, who, according to Yazıcıoğlu Ali, numbered 'ten to twenty thousand persons'.⁸ When İzzeddin fled to Crimea, the emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologos, captured his younger sons. One son converted to Christianity, together with his followers, and they were settled by the emperor in the Macedonian town of Verria (later Karaferya, Verroia). When Verria became Ottoman (1387), these Seljuks became vassals and served in the Ottoman army. Yıldırım Bayezid resettled them around Zichné in Macedonia, where they remained as a sizeable Turkish-speaking Christian group until well into the twentieth century.

Yazıcıoğlu Ali met their leaders around 1422 when they had come to renew their documents on the occasion of the ascension to the throne of Murad II, and related their story. Some decades ago Elizabeth Zachariadou published five

Die Steppevölker, Attila, Dschingis Khan, Tamerlan (Munich, 1970), pp. 244–63. Still highly valuable is Joseph Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge – Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts* (ca. 840–940) (Leipzig, 1903; 2nd edn, Darmstadt, 1961).

⁸ Paul Wittek, 'Les Gagauzes: les gens de Kaykâüz', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 17 (1952), 19–20.

documents from the archives of the Athonite monastery of Vatopedi which dealt with the Seljuk princes at Verria, who had become large landowners and protectors of the Holy Mountain. In fact, they had converted to Christianity long before Yazıcıoğlu Ali suggests.⁹ The converted Seljuk Turks from Macedonia have kept their identity as a group till today and live as Christians largely around the town of Nea Zihni, still using their old Turkish language. The Anatolian Seljuk-Turkish origin of the Gagauz – today a group of several hundred thousand people, largely living in the Republic of Moldova – is still vehemently contested in Bulgarian historiography. They are presented as Bulgarians who have kept their Christian faith but lost their Bulgarian language. Yet the evidence of the sources is overwhelming and the problem of their origin was, in fact, already solved more than half a century ago. Linguistic research in the area by Tadeusz Kowalski in the 1930s pointed to at least three layers of spoken Turkish in north-eastern Bulgaria. The oldest one was North Turkish, deriving from settlers who had come via the Russian steppes; the second was related to Anatolian Turkish but was pre-Ottoman. The youngest layer was Ottoman and also came from the south.¹⁰ Finally, the Byzantines, after regaining a base at the Morea (1261), used Turkish mercenaries on a vast scale, groups of whom remained behind on the peninsula and became assimilated slowly into the native population. All three groups of pre-Ottoman Turks, in varying degrees, contributed to the incorporation of the Balkans and the spread of Islam. This is clearest of all in north-eastern Bulgaria and eastern Romania, in the wide expanses of the Deli Orman and the Dobrudja, where, according to the Ottoman *tahrir defters* of the early sixteenth century,¹¹ the majority of the population was Muslim, and, judging by the toponyms and personal names, Turkish speaking. The late nineteenth-century Ottoman census as contained in the *salname* of the Tuna vilayet of 1290/1873 shows a population which was two-thirds Muslim Turkish.¹² In the Rhodope mountains and the north Aegean plains at their feet, the percentage of Muslims was even higher. The *salname* of the Edirne vilayet of 1310/1892–3 mentions that in the large *sancak*

9 For the Gagauz, their origin and the sources about them see Wittek, 'Les Gagaouzes', pp. 12–24; P. Wittek, 'Yazıcıoğlu 'Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobrudja', *The Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14, 3 (1952), 652–88. For the Christianised Seljuks of Verria (Karaferya) and their foundations on Mount Athos see E. A. Zachariadou, 'Οἱ Χριστιανοὶ Ἀπόγονοὶ τοῦ Ἰλζεδδίν Καϊκαοῦς Β' στὴ Βέροια', *Μακεδονικά* 6 (1964/5), 62–74. P. Wittek, 'La descendance chrétienne de la dynastie Seljouk en Macedoine', *Echos d'Orient* 30 (1934), pp. 409–12.

10 Tadeusz Kowalski, *Les Turcs et la langue turc de la Bulgarie du nord-est* (Krakow, 1933).

11 Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi [henceforth BOA], Tapu Tarih Defteri [henceforth TT] 367.

12 *Salname-i Vilayet-i Tuna, 1290* (1873) (Ruse, 1290) (population tables on pp. 265–309).

of Gümülcine (today Komotini in Greek Thrace), with 273 settlements, 84 per cent of the population was Muslim. In the smaller administrative units, such as the *kaza* of Sultanyeri (around Koşukavak; since 1933, Krumovgrad) with 100 settlements, the percentage of Muslims reached 97 per cent.¹³ Without the presence of a pre-Ottoman Turkish or Turkic population such numbers are not understandable. They formed the basis of the transformation of the Balkans after the Ottoman take-over, although in the available Balkan historiography this point is (with some exceptions) largely left in the dark for obvious reasons.

Early Ottoman conquest and settlement

The first half of the fourteenth century was filled with military contacts between various Turkish groups from western Asia Minor and the eastern Balkans, which prepared the way for the final take-over after 1354. The soil of Byzantine Thrace was, over half a century, carefully prepared for the Ottoman conquest and subsequent resettling. In 1303–4 the Byzantines had invited a large army (7,500 men) of jobless Catalan mercenaries to fight for them in western Anatolia in order to stop the advancing Turkomans. From their base at Gallipoli (Gelibolu) on the Dardanelles they did this rather successfully till 1305 when they broke with the emperor, who had murdered their leader. In the same year, according to Nikephoros Gregoras, the Catalans invited Turks from Anatolia to join them, 800 horse and 2,000 on foot. According to the other contemporary Byzantine historian, George Pachymeres, they came from Aydın, and among them were many Anatolian Greeks.¹⁴ In 1307 they were reinforced by a group of Tourkopouloi, baptised Turks, very probably some of the former followers of İzzeddin Kaykaus from the Dobrudja who had entered Byzantine service. The group joining the multi-national army at Gallipoli is said to have numbered 1,000 horsemen and 500 on foot. The chronicler of the Catalans, one of their chiefs and witness of the events, Ramon Muntaner, gives us a vivid impression of what effect this army, large for the time and place, had on the fertile and open land of Thrace:

¹³ *Edirne Vilayet Salnamesi, 1310 (1892/3)* (Edirne 1310), p. 440. The total population of the *sancak* of Gümülcine was 245,072 'men and women, local and foreign population', 206,914 Muslims, 20,671 Bulgarians, 15,241 Greek Orthodox, 912 Gypsies, 739 Jews, 360 Armenians and 235 foreigners. For Sultanyeri (pp. 455–7), for both men and women, the total was 48,816, 1,490 Bulgarians, 3 Greeks, 811 Gypsies (half Muslim) and 47,953 Muslims, judging by the village names all Turkish speaking.

¹⁴ Nicolas Oikonomides, 'The Turks in Europe (1305–1313) and the Serbs in Asia Minor (1313)', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1993), pp. 159–68.

Now it is the truth that we had been in the peninsula of Gallipoli and in the district seven years since the death of the Caesar, and we had lived there five years on the land and there was nothing left. And so, likewise, we had depopulated all that district for ten days' journey in every direction: we had destroyed all the people, so that nothing could be gathered there. Therefore we were obliged to abandon that country. And this was the decision of En Rocafort and those who were with him . . .¹⁵

More destruction was wrought by the Byzantine civil war between Andronikos II and Andronikos III (1321–8), partly fought by Turkish mercenaries in Byzantine service. In 1329, 1331, 1332 and 1334 Turkish forces, presumably Ottomans, raided Thrace and Macedonia but, in spite of this, the Byzantines continued to make use of their services. In 1337, Aydınoğlu Umur Bey provided the emperor with 2,000 soldiers for his campaign against the rebellious Albanians, and, in 1341, the emperor allowed the fleet of Umur Bey to pass through the Bosphorus to attack Bulgaria via the Danube. Andronikos III died in June 1341 and this was the signal for the Serbs, Albanians and Turkish pirates to plunder Macedonia. Andronikos's death led to another Byzantine civil war between John V Palaeologos and John VI Kantakouzenos, which, with interruptions, lasted from 1341 to 1347 and wrought havoc on sorely tried Thrace and Macedonia.¹⁶ Both sides used Turkish mercenaries, first from Aydın, and, after Umur Bey's death (1348), from among the Ottomans. Meanwhile the Serbians conquered the whole of Byzantine Macedonia, Epirus and Thessaly and pushed as far as the Gulf of Corinth. In 1346, in Skopje (Üsküp), Tsar Dušan had himself crowned 'Emperor of the Greeks and the Serbs' with great ceremony. Although Byzantium continued to survive as a sort of city-state until 1453, it had committed suicide as a power of any kind during the long civil war.

Even if Kantakouzenos had not opened up the Balkans for the Ottomans they would have come on their own account. After Tsar Dušan died (1355), his short-lived empire broke into more than half a dozen mutually warring principalities. Bulgaria, broken into three pieces, had already ceased to be a power of any significance after 1330. Greece was a mosaic of warring mini-states. There was no power left in the Balkans to stop the Ottomans: they filled up a political vacuum. Soon they were also to fill the huge population gap in

15 R. Muntaner, *The Chronicle of Muntaner*, tr. from the Catalan by Lady Goodenough (London, 1921), p. 551.

16 For this crucial time see especially Donald M. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor: a Biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk, c.1295–1383* (Cambridge, 1996); also Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1993). See also the penetrating overview of Ernst Werner, 'Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa und Orhan', *Byzantino-Slavica* 26 (1965), 255–76.

the lowlands of Thrace and the plains and the rolling lands of Macedonia, where there was ample room to settle. Indeed, the long Byzantine civil wars, combined with the disastrous effects from 1348 onward of the Black Death (to which the settled population was more vulnerable than the mobile Turks), had well prepared the soil for Ottoman take-over.

From their base at Tzympe on the Gallipoli peninsula, which they took in 1352 when serving the emperor's son Matthew, Ottoman forces under Prince Süleyman occupied and resettled the important harbour and fortress town of Gallipoli (Gelibolu), whose walls had collapsed in March 1353 as a result of a violent earthquake and whose inhabitants had fled. The date is handed down in a Byzantine Short Chronicle and confirmed by the Florentine annalist Matteo Villani, who wrote between 1346 and 1362.¹⁷ An early Ottoman account, incorporated in Aşıkpaşazade's chronicle, stresses the point that the local population of Tzympe and its district supported the Ottoman forces in their actions, and were left in peace. It is notable that the Ottoman taxation and population registers from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries show numerous Greek Christian villages on the Gallipoli peninsula. When plotted on a map they give an impression of the destruction of Thrace before 1353 and show us where the native population survived. An impression of the deserted situation of Thrace at the time of the Turkish conquest is also found in the same early account as preserved by Aşıkpaşazade, where Süleyman Paşa is reported to have sent a message to his father, Orhan, stating that 'if the castles and territories now conquered are to be put in good order many of the people of Islam are required', and a few lines later adding: 'Incessantly, day by day, people from Karası [the land opposite the straits] moved in. Where they arrived they took their homes and devoted themselves to the fight for the faith. In this manner the forces of Islam got a solid base and wherever they went and moved forward the unbelievers could no longer stop them.'¹⁸

In 1366, in one of his speeches, Demetrios Kydones remarks bitterly that the Turks now lived in Thrace in greater security than the Byzantines and that the province had now been transformed into a Turkish land.¹⁹ The oldest preserved Ottoman *tahrir defters* allow us to give sound numbers for certain fixed areas. The register 0.89 in the Muallim Cevdet collection, a large fragment

17 For the conquest of Gallipoli and the sources see Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1481* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 24–5.

18 Aşıkpaşazade, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur Hohen Pforte*, tr. R. Kreutel, (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1959), p. 78; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, ed. Ali (Istanbul, 1332), pp. 49–50.

19 Demetrius Kydones, *Oratio pro Subsidiis Latinorum*, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. CLIV, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1880), col. 965, cited by D. Angelov, 'Certains aspects de la conquête des peuples balkaniques par les Turcs', *Byzantino-Slavica* 17 (1956), 264.

dated 1452–5, contains a complete description of the *nahiye* of Gümülcine (Komotini) which included three old fortified Byzantine towns – Gümülcine, Makri and Maroneia – and forty-nine villages. Seven of these villages which had non-Turkish names, four Greek and three Bulgarian (Ostrovic, Veternik and Stoyan), were exclusively Christian. The four others were mixed Muslim and Christian, Gümülcine and Makri were also mixed, and Maroneia was, with 162 households, the largest, and exclusively Christian, settlement. The forty-two villages with Turkish names had all, except Saslu (with twenty-five Christian households), Muslim inhabitants, 927 in all. This shows that the Christian settlements were more than double the size of the Muslim villages, the latter evidently being the newer ones. The large size of the Christian settlements reflects the concentrations of population in the troubled time before and after the conquest. Of the rural Muslim population (not counting the towns) the 1452–5 register shows that 30 per cent were *yürüks* (nomads). The majority of the Turkish colonists must thus have settled down and turned to agriculture in the seventy-eight years between the conquest and the 1452–5 register. With 511 households, of which 422 were Muslims, the town of Gümülcine was by far the largest settlement of the district. It is also of interest to see that among the Muslims of the *nahiye* of Gümülcine the urban element dominated over the unsettled *yürük* population. The proportions were 34 per cent urban, 46 per cent rural-settled and 20 per cent *yürük*. As a whole, the Muslim population constituted 72 per cent of the total (1,396 Muslim households and 531 of Christians).²⁰

The conquest of the town of Gümülcine is traditionally placed in 1361, and was the work of Gazi Evrenos, who set up his residence there. The facts that large parts of the Byzantine town walls enclosing a rectangle of 115 by 125 metres still stand and that a sizeable Christian population continued to live in it and keep its bishop's church, combined with the fact that Gazi Evrenos constructed a number of important buildings (a domed mosque, a monumental *zaviye* and a *hamam*) outside the walls as the nucleus of the new Muslim settlement, strongly suggest that the town was taken by treaty, not by force. The written sources, however, are silent on this point.

The fate of other old Byzantine settlements, about which a little information is contained in the 1452–5 *tahrir*, was different. Ottoman Ferecik, now Pherrai on the Greek side of the Maritsa (Meriç) in Thrace, was throughout the Ottoman period the administrative centre of a *kaza*, comprising fifty-six villages.²¹

20 Atatürk Kitaplığı (Istanbul), Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları o.89, pp. 35–66.

21 BOA, TT 370 (1528–30), p. 50.

The town originated from a large Byzantine monastery, fortified in 1152 by Isakios Komnenos, brother of the emperor John II Komnenos. The charter of the monastery describes the land where it came into being as 'empty of men and habitations'.²² Villehardouin, chronicler of the fourth crusade, calls it 'Abbeie de Vera'. The toponym is Slavic and means 'swamp', 'swampy land'. In 1323, when the Bulgarian Tsar Michael Šišman invaded Thrace, he could not take much booty because the villagers had fled inside the spacious and strong wall of the monastery, together with their cattle. John Kantakouzenos, who as a regent visited the place in 1342, 1347 and 1352, explicitly mentions that, alongside the monks, peasants lived in the monastery, which he called a 'fortress' or a 'very strong fortress'.²³ In 1342–3 Aydınoğlu Umur Bey tried in vain to take the castle. In 1355, when the garrison surrendered to Kantakouzenos's enemy and successor, the place was inhabited only by 'a few savage villagers'.²⁴ The Ottomans took it in 1357, shortly before Süleyman Paşa died. Local memory, preserved among the Ferecik Muslims, presents Süleyman Paşa as the conqueror of the town and the one who converted the great church of the Kosmosoteira into a mosque, which later was to bear his name. This story is recorded in the *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* of the poet-historian Hadidi, a native of Ferecik, who, in 906/1500–1, wrote the inscription of the new minaret of the church/mosque and, in 1516, is known to have been the inspector of the *vakıf* of Süleyman Paşa in Ferecik.²⁵ The Ottoman chroniclers give a confused picture of Ferecik's conquest. Only Hadidi gives the correct date (759/1357) while the chroniclers Nişancı Mehmed Paşa and Gelibolulu Ali, with 759/1358, come very close.²⁶ Immediately after the conquest, a sizeable group of Muslims must have been settled in the little town, alongside the surviving Christians. In 1433, the Burgundian knight Bertrandon de la Broquière passed through the town, which he describes as follows:

And from there I came to a town which is called Vira. In this town there was a beautiful castle, which is now torn down in some places. A young Greek told me that once there were 300 monks in it, and there still is the choir of the church, out of which the Turks have made their mosque. Around this castle they have built a big city which is inhabited by Greeks and Turks. And this town is on a hill near the Maritsa.²⁷

22. Louis Petit, *Typikon de la Kosmosoteira* (Sofia, 1913).

23. John Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum Libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1828–32), II, p. 196.

24. Kantakouzenos, *Historiarum*, III, p. 310. 25. BOA, TT 77, p. 442.

26. 'Ferecik' in *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* [henceforth TDVİA], XII (1995), pp. 371–3 (Machiel Kiel).

27. Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d'Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière*, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), pp. 179–80.

The 1452–5 *tahrir* is the first to give sound numbers, noting 215 Muslim and 58 Christian households, altogether perhaps 1,200 inhabitants. Yet for time and place this was a sizeable town. The walled enclosure of the old monastery measures less than a hectare. Using the usual formula for medieval towns of 150 inhabitants to a hectare and 250–300 for a heavily built-up area we may conclude that late Byzantine Vira (Vera, Ferecik) cannot have had many more Christian inhabitants than in 1453.²⁸ The Ottomans must have settled mainly outside the walls. Among the public buildings they erected were the *zaviye*, *hamam* (baths) and caravansary of Hacı Turhan, and a number of shops.²⁹ The ruin of the *hamam*, with features of the late fourteenth century, still survives (as of 2006). Ferecik remained a small town throughout its history, in 1319/1901–2 having 3,500 Muslim inhabitants as well as 300 Bulgars and 300 Greeks.³⁰ There is no record of where the Turkish settlers of Ferecik came from, but, as in the case of Gümülcine, the land of Karası, south of the Dardanelles, is the most likely place.

In some cases the preserved foundation charters of some very early *vakıfs* in the Balkans show us where a part of the new urban elite came from. A case in point is the two *vakıfiyes* of the *zaviye* of Bahaüddin Paşa b. Hızır in the Macedonian city of Serres from 790/1388 and 792/1390, that is, five years after Serres was taken. The *zaviye* was built for Şeyh Hızır from Tokat, and was under the responsibility of Ali b. Ömer Karahisarı. People from Amasya, Ankara, İznik, Kayseri, Kırşehir and Niksar (all except İznik cities in central Anatolia) signed the documents.³¹

Most of the Ottoman records are preserved in an incomplete state, as parts or fragments. They have not been published or studied in a systematic manner. It is only the series of registers compiled in 1528–30 on the basis of the first census of Süleyman the Magnificent that give us a complete picture, with all settlements and all separate groups of society being covered.³² Settlement patterns in normal times do not change overnight, and because after the late fourteenth century no great upheavals are known in the history of the land south of the Balkan chain, this sound documentary base can be used

28 For this rule of thumb see Josiah Cox Russell, *Medieval Regions and their Cities* (Newton Abbot, 1972), who gives a multitude of examples of surface and inhabitants.

29 Atatürk Kitaplığı (Istanbul), Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları 0.89.

30 Salname-i Vilayet-i Edirne, 1319 [1901–2], section 'Ferecik'.

31 M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *XV–XVI Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı, Vakıflar – Mülkler – Mukataaalar*, vol. II (Istanbul, 1952), pp. 221–5; for this and other *vakıfs* see Evangelia Balta, *Les vakıfs des Serrès et de sa region (XVe–XVIe s.)*, (Athens, 1995).

32 This register is now published in Necati Aktaş, Mustafa Kaplan and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer (eds.), *167 Numaralı Muhasebe-i Vilayet-i Rum İli Defteri (937/1530)*, vol. I (Ankara, 2003), Gümülcine and Yenice-i Karasu, pp. 7–29.

retrospectively to draw some general conclusions. It shows us the profound changes in Thrace after the Ottoman take-over. According to the census and taxation register of 1528 for the *kazas* of Gümülcine and Yenice-i Karasu,³³ the number of Muslim households was 6,298 and of Christian households 3,828, giving a total of 10,126. Of the population 62 per cent was Muslim; 1,231 households of Christians, or 32 per cent, lived in three towns (Xanthi, Enos and Makri), while 565 households of Muslims, or 9 per cent lived in the towns. Of the rural Muslim households, 1,773 (28 per cent of all the Muslims) were *yürüks*. One-quarter of the total population, 2,569 households, enjoyed tax benefits against specific duties: 412 households were *tuzcus*, or saltworkers (three-quarters of them Christian); 141 were miners, almost all Christians; 124 were rice growers (*çeltikci*), almost all Muslims. The largest group of privileged people were the 1,773 households of *yürüks*.³⁴

In the Byzantine as well as in the early Ottoman narrative sources some scattered information is given about the Ottoman colonisation of the Balkans, especially as regards one aspect: deportation on government order. Chalkokondyles mentions the settlement of Turks mainly in three areas: around Philippolis (Filibe, modern Plovdiv) in Thrace, around Serres in Aegean Macedonia, and around Skopje (Üsküp) in northern Macedonia. Aşıkpaşazade mentions two deportations to the plains of Filibe, one of which was of *yürüks* of Saruhan in western Anatolia under the command of Ertuğrul, son of Bayezid I, in 798/1394–5. They were settled to the south-west of the place where later the town of Tatar Pazarcik was to be founded. Their centre was Saruhanbeyli, which survived under the name Saran Bej till 1949, when it was renamed Septemvri. In a piece of verse the annalist remarks that when a ruler orders the ‘repopulation of empty lands’, those concerned have to accept it as their fate. Neşri has the same story in a shorter version, and adds that ‘now the land of Filibe is fully theirs’.³⁵

The second remark on deportation concerns a group of Tatars led by Minnet Bey, who roamed the land around İskilip in northern Asia Minor. On his way back from Samsun, Sultan Mehmed I saw there a large number of Tatar tents which he ordered to be transferred to Rumeli because they had not joined him on his military campaigns:

33 These two districts together include five towns – Gümülcine (Komotini), Yenice-i Karasu (Genisea), İsketiye İskeçe (Xanthi), Meğri (Makri) and Enos – and 223 villages. The districts of Ferecik (Pherrai, Fera) and Dimetoka (Didymoteichon) are not included.

34 BOA, TT 167.

35 Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1949, 1957), II, p. 543.

He had Minnet Bey brought before him and ordered him [Minnet Bey] to leave the land. And he transported all these people to the district of Filibe and gave them the land around the castle of Konuş as residence. Minnet's son Mehmed Bey erected in Konuş an *imaret* and a caravansaray as well, and there they settled and took this [lowland] district as their residence.³⁶

Mevlana Neşri³⁷ and the Anonymous-Giese have almost exactly the same story. Konuş and its caravansary is mentioned by a long list of sixteenth-century western travellers. Minnet Bey's son, Minnetoğlu Mehmed Bey, became the first Ottoman governor of Bosnia (1463). The Anonymous-Giese has an interesting remark on the people of Rumeli, stating that:

When Timur Han entered this country [Anatolia] he spread such terror that nobody dared to stand against him and the majority of the people of those districts he entered fled and crossed the sea and spilled out over Rumeli. Yes, many Arabs, Kurds, Turkoman and Anatolians fled and went over to Rumeli. People who lived in these times have reported: we saw in Rumeli many people who said, 'We are Arabs, others Turkoman or Kurds or of Anatolian origin. Others said we come from Çagatay.' They all had fled and came to Rumeli. And they are the real reason that the greater part of Rumeli became populated.³⁸

The account is impressionistic and certainly exaggerated. When, however, we accept the vague term 'land of the Romans' as largely being identical with Thrace in its widest sense, then the remark is pretty much correct, and is strongly supported by the situation as shown by the 1521 *tahrir*.

The Byzantine historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles also mentions a number of deportations from Asia Minor to the Balkans. In Thrace, he adds (apart from Filibe) Turkish settlement in the Zagora, the land around the modern cities of Stara Zagora and Nova Zagora, which is lacking in the Ottoman sources. Chalkokondyles also mentions deportations to the districts of Serres and Üsküp. Serres, the key to eastern Macedonia, was taken by the Ottomans under Çandarlı Hayreddin. After the conquest of Verria (Ottoman Karaferya) in May 1387,³⁹ Gazi Evrenos Bey, until then residing in Gümülcine, received

36 Aşıkpaşazade, *Vom Hirtenzelt*, tr. Kreutel, p. 129; ed. Ali, p. 91.

37 Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, II, p. 543.

38 Friedrich Giese (ed.), *Die Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken in Text und Übersetzung*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1922–5), II, p. 62.

39 For the date of the conquest of Verria see Peter Schreiner (ed.), *Chronica byzantina breviora. Die byzantinische Kleinchroniken*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1975–9), II, p. 334. Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1843), I, p. 19–20. Aşıkpaşazade, *Vom Hirtenzelt*, tr. Kreutel, p. 93; ed. Ali, pp. 61–2, connects the date of

Serres as his seat. Aşıkpaşazade, the Anonymous-Giese and Neşri mention that the important cities of this part of Macedonia, Kavala, Drama, Zichne and Serres, were all taken by treaty. After these events it had become useless to keep Gümülcine as an advanced base on the border (*uc*) because it now lay more than 200 kilometres inland. We have to understand that Gazi Evrenos organised the deportation of *yürüks* from Saruhan in western Anatolia in 1385, as mentioned by Aşıkpaşazade and Chalkokondyles, and to the Üsküp region in or shortly after 1390, when the principalities of Saruhan and Aydın were annexed by Bayezid I.⁴⁰ Chalkokondyles even gives some details: 'After this he brought his affairs in order. First of all he [the sultan] took the Greeks into his friendship and as allies. He made peace with the princes of Macedonia and dispatched a great number of real Turks [no converts] from Asia as well as from Europe with their families to live in the city of the Scopians'.⁴¹ Üsküp and its plain is one of the focal points of the southern Balkans, where at least six important roads converge. Turks, mainly craftsmen, were settled outside the cramped Byzantino-Slavic fortified town, where an important section of the local Christian population continued to live. The oldest preserved Ottoman register containing Üsküp and its district is TT 12 from 1454.⁴² It describes 23 Muslim *mahalles* (quarters, districts) with 444 households and 72 male Muslim individuals (*nefer*), as well as 286 Christian households and another 26 households headed by widows. With 3,500–3,700 inhabitants, Üsküp had become one of the largest urban centres of the Balkan interior. The number of Muslims (two-thirds of the town's total population) shows the magnitude of the change. It is interesting to see that among the Muslim *mahalles* of the town there is one called Ali Menteşeli, pointing to settlers from that south-west Anatolian district annexed by the Ottomans around 1390. The conquest of Üsküp, beginning January 1392, is mentioned as a marginal note in an old Serbian church book.⁴³ Almost all Ottoman sources mention only that Paşa Yiğit Bey was sent against Üsküp by Bayezid I some time after his accession to the throne (June 1389). Only Kemalpaşazade describes the conquest in some detail, but the part of his chronicle mentioning it only became available recently in published form.⁴⁴

787/1385–6 with these events. Only after the spring of 1387, when Thessalonike was finally taken, was the situation stable enough to start the reorganisation of the land.

40 Aşıkpaşazade, *Vom Hirtenzelt*, tr. Kreutel, p. 97; Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 312–13.

41 Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Demonstrationes*, ed. E. Darkó, vol. I (Budapest, 1922–3), p. 94.

42 Published in Macedonian translation by Metodija Sokoloski, *Turski Dokumenti za Istorijata na Makedonskiot Narod*, 4 vols. (Skopje, 1963–72), III, pp. 143–283.

43 Published by Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stari Stpski Zapisi I Nadpisi* (Belgrade, 1908).

44 İbn Kemal (Kemalpaşazade), *Tevarih-i At-i Osman*, IV *Defter*, ed. Koji Imazava (Ankara, 2000), pp. 27–37.

The settlement of Turks in Üsküp was largely confined to the town itself. The 1454 register lists ten small villages with Turkish place names and 123 Muslim households in the great triangular plain of Üsküp.⁴⁵ Of the whole of the Muslim population of the Üsküp district, four-fifths lived in the town. It was only in later times, particularly in the course of the sixteenth century, that a dozen or more Turkish villages came into being in the plain, and the population of the old villages trebled. Yet the predominance of the town as the principal Turkish centre remained.

There is another account of Turkish settlement in the Balkans recorded in the narrative sources. The lost Ottoman chronicle known as *Codex Hanivaldanus*, preserved in Leunclavius's *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum*, mentions that in the mid-fifteenth century Turkish colonists moved to the land between Şumnu (Şumen) and Silistra in north-eastern Bulgaria and worked small plots of land, and, at the same time, served in the army as *akıncıs* (raiders). A note from the time of Sultan Selim I preserved in the 'proto-statistic' of the empire from 1528–30 seems to refer to this group of settlers.⁴⁶ It says that before 1516–17, 1,280 households, or perhaps 6,000–6,500 people, had come 'from Anatolia to the Dobrudja in the time of the sultans of bygone ages as a result of *sürgün* (deportation)', and enjoyed certain tax benefits. This wave of settlers must have arrived shortly after the crusade of Varna, 1444, when the north-east Bulgarian lowlands suffered heavy devastation at the hands of the crusaders. An indication of this is the Ottoman name of the old castle of Petrič near Varna, which, like the other castles in the area (Galata, Mağliš, Madara, Kavarna, Kalliakra), was destroyed by the crusaders and not later rebuilt. The Ottomans after 1444 resettled the entire empty plateau south of Lake Devnja with twenty villages of Turks. One of them was Ak Viran, so called after the ruins of the castle of Petrič, which was built of the soft whitish limestone characteristic of north-eastern Bulgaria. The incoming settlers gave a new name (White Ruin) to the place, but the 1516–17 register still adds 'also known as Petrič'. Ak Viran was later corrupted to Avren and became the name of the entire plateau. In 1935 its name was changed to Momino.

A good guide for reconstructing the history of the Turkish colonisation of the eastern Balkans could have been that faithful mirror of history, the toponymy. Yet it was precisely this source of history that was ruthlessly destroyed on the orders of the nationalist Bulgarian government in 1934–5,

45 TT 4 published in Aleksandar Stojanovski and Mihailo Apostolski (eds.), *Turski Dokumenti za Istorija na Makedonskiot Narod* (Skopje, 1972), pp. 434–9.

46 BOA, TT 367.

and in Greece in a more piecemeal fashion.⁴⁷ An indication of the importance of the Turkish toponyms in Bulgaria is given by Minčev and Koledarov. Turkish toponyms totalled 43 per cent of all place names in the country. Indicative also are the old village names in eastern Bulgaria, still to be seen on the Austrian, German and Russian 1:200,000 military maps of the Balkans, pointing to districts in Anatolia where the settlers originated, like Germiyanlı (near Aydos, Karnobat and near Yambol), Menteşeli (near Yenice Kızılağaç/Elhovo and Doyran in Macedonia) or Saruhanlı (near Silistra and Rusokastro), or even more drastic ones like Anadolulu (near Rusokastro, Karnobat, Hirsovo and Yambol) or Anadolu Hüseyin, east of Šumen. Others point more directly to the town of origin, like Geredelü near Kızılağaç/Elhovo, and near Aydos, Ahlatlı (near Karnobat), Kastamonlular (near Veliko Tirnovο), Karahisarlı (near Hasköy/Haskovo) or Tokatlı (near Yambol). There are also indications of the resettlement of colonists inside the Balkans (to which the note of Chalkokondyles about Üsküp also points); examples of this are the villages of Great and Small Filebelülər near Razgrad and near Varna, or Zağralı near Eski Cuma/Tărgoviște.

The Ottoman colonisation of the great eastern plain of Thessaly, with Yenişehir Larissa as its centre, was not noted by the chroniclers. Apart from some legendary stories recorded by Urquhard and Fallmerayer at the beginning of the nineteenth century, our best guide is the 1455 register, *defter Maliye Müdever* No. 10, the oldest preserved for that part of Greece.⁴⁸ Eastern Thessaly was practically deserted when the Ottomans came (1388–9), its former capital Larissa had been a heap of ruins since the 1330s and its bishop's church was a retreat for bandits, as Archbishop Antonius of Larissa assures us in 1360. He therefore resided in Trikkala in the western plain, which was in a good condition and relatively well settled. The Ottomans under Evrenos Bey and his son Barak Bey founded their 'New Town' (Yenişehir) outside the ruins of old Larissa, where a few Christians had survived. Eastern Thessaly was destroyed in the first three decades of the fourteenth century during the endless local wars, by the Catalan invasion and especially by the Albanians. According to the 1455 register the new town had 355 Muslim households and 66 of Christians. It is illustrative of the resettlement of this town that the vast majority of the

47 A complete survey of the changes of the toponyms in Bulgaria is given by Nikolaj Minčev and Peter Koledarov, *Promenite na imenata i statute and selištata na Bălgarija, 1878–1971* (Sofia, 1972).

48 BOA, Maliyeden Müdever [henceforth MAD] 10 is now available in transcription and in the original script: Melek Delilbaşı and Muzaffer Arıkan, *Hicrî 859 Tarihli Sûret-i Sancak-ı Tirhala*, 2 vols. (Ankara, 2001).

inhabitants were craftsmen, such as weavers, tanners, tailors and coppersmiths. The names of the villages east of the town read like a geographical textbook: Aydınlı, Germiyanlı, Menteşeli, Saruhanlı, all of the major provinces of western Anatolia are present. Further, some village names point to tribal groups from western Anatolia, such as the Cullular, known in the Aydın district, or the Sarucular from the Kocaeli district east of Bursa.⁴⁹

The later numerous Turkish population of parts of the former Yugoslav Macedonia was also present at a very early date, although still in minor groups. The district was annexed without great upheaval after its Christian lords, 'King' Marko and Constantin Dejanović of Velbužd (Köstendil), had perished in the battle of Rovine (1395) fighting for Sultan Bayezid whose vassals they were. The oldest preserved Ottoman register is TT 237, a fragment from the short first reign of Mehmed II (1445).⁵⁰ In 1445, according to this register, the *kaza* of Köprülü (Veles) along the Vardar river had six settlements with a Muslim population. The town of Köprülü itself had 190 households, of which only nine were Muslim (not counting the *kadı* and a garrison of twenty Muslim soldiers). Slowly, in the course of time, through more settlement and through a slow process of conversion to Islam, the number of Muslims in Köprülü went up to one-third of the whole population (19,700 in 1900, according to Kānčov's figures). In 1445, there were five villages with Turkish place names and Muslim inhabitants (Çeltükçiler, Hisar Beyli, Karasılar, Koçi and Suyakları), mostly *yürüks*, of which one group evidently came from the land of Karası. In time these villages also grew, and more were founded in the early sixteenth century. The area to the east of the Vardar is still known locally as 'Yurukluk'.⁵¹

Another nucleus of the Turkish settlement was in the great Pelagonian plain in west Macedonia, between Prilep and Manastır (Monastir, Bitola), and further southwards into today's northern Greece. The register TT 4, part of a series which Ursinus has convincingly dated to 1454–5, has the villages of

49 For the sources and for more details see M. Kiel, 'Das türkische Thessalien, etabliertes geschichtsbild versus osmanische quellen. Ein beitrag zur entmythologisierung der geschichte Griechenlands', *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil. Hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge* No. 212, 1996, 153–65.

50 BOA, TT 237.

51 The 1445 register has been published in Sokoloski, *Turski Dokumenti*, II, pp. 23–67. Vasil Kānčov's work *Makedonija, Etnografija, Statistika* (Sofia, 1900) (reprint 1973) is regarded as containing the most reliable population statistics on late Ottoman Greater Macedonia. They are better also than the numbers contained in the various Ottoman *salnames*, which were made for public use and often inflate the number of Muslims and slightly reduce those of the Christians. The Ottoman *nüfus defters* (population registers), however, made for government use, were largely correct, as Kānčov discovered.

Dedebalı, Timur, Şeleverci and Ali Obası with the explicit remark that they were *yürüks*, were free of most taxes but in return had to serve in the army as *eşkinici* (irregular cavalymen).⁵² In the *kaza* of Manastır, very near the four villages mentioned (of which three still exist), was the village of Kanatlar. However, the great mass of Turkish colonists in the southern part of the Pelagonian plain, around Kayalar and Cuma Pazarı, had evidently not yet arrived. They were to come in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, when unrest and heterodoxy fomented rebellion (the Kalenderoğlu revolt) and drove many tribal groups to settle in the peaceful plains of the southern Balkans. The same is also partly true for the three dozen *yürük* villages east of the Vardar, in the Štip area: the Ofçebolu Yürükleri. Some of these groups had settled before the 1519 census was taken, many others came afterwards, in the 1520s and 1530s.

The sources mentioned here give a variegated picture of the Ottoman settlement and colonisation of the Balkans. It seems that, at first, there was a spontaneous push of nomad settlers from western Anatolia, where there were many Turkoman nomads, to lands largely empty of population, that is, the greater part of Thrace; then the second wave, caused by refugees fleeing Timur's aggression; and, third, government-ordered deportations. These three categories are reflected in the sources. The fourth category, the slow and unorganised movement of peoples from Anatolia to the eastern Balkans, and, from there, deeper inland to Macedonia, stretched over the whole fifteenth, and also the first half of the sixteenth century, but remained unrecorded in the chronicles. We only find them in the Ottoman *tahrir defters*, which, for many districts, allow us to see the intensity of the Turkish colonisation. They also show us which areas were not affected by it, namely, where the bulk of the native Slav, Greek or Albanian population remained where it always had been.

For decades the Turkish colonisation has been forcefully denied in Bulgarian historiography. The reason behind this is political, not scientific. Moreover, Bulgarian historians and Ottomanists were unable to make use of the rich source materials preserved in the Turkish archives, having to work with a few disconnected fragments in the Sofia National Library. The emphasis was on the aspect of conversion to Islam, which is indeed clearly visible in the sources but gained momentum only in the seventeenth century. Yugoslav historiography, doubtless the brightest of the entire Balkans, relied heavily on the Ottoman

52. BOA, TT 4, ff. 61–2. Michael Ursinus, 'An Ottoman Census Register for the Area of Serres of 859 (1454/55)', *Südost-Forschungen* 45 (1986), 25–36.

tahrirs, of which complete sets of microfilms were available from the early 1950s. This has led to the publication of long series of sources as well as studies based on them. Here both aspects are stressed, colonisation and conversion. It was only in 1994, after the great political changes in eastern Europe, that Turks and Bulgarians reached an agreement for mutual exchange of microfilms of Ottoman source material, a process which continues and will ultimately change the entire Bulgarian historiography. The first *tahrir* register of Albania, the oldest of the entire Balkans, from 1432, was published in 1954 by Halil İnalçık.⁵³ The Albanians have produced excellent publications of some entire *tahrirs*, but in Albanian historiography Turkish colonisation was not dealt with because it never took place. Almost three-quarters of the population of Albania converted to Islam, but this process stretched over a full four centuries.⁵⁴

Turkish colonisation and settlement in Greece is not a popular topic. Moreover, this neglected subject suffers from the fact that, disregarding two or three rare exceptions, Greece had no scholars able to read the Ottoman administrative scripts and most historians are hardly aware of what a wealth of sources is available. In spite of this, a promising new approach to the whole Turkish period in Greece is discernible, mostly the work of young scholars trained in western universities. Finally, some good work on the topic has been done by Turkish scholars, but here the accent has been heavily on colonisation, leaving the Islamisation of the native Balkan population underexposed. To sum up, the comprehensive work on how much of the Balkans became truly Turkish will take a long time to be written; yet we can at least conclude for now that the land to the east of the line from Nikopol (Nikopolis, Niğbolu) on the Danube to Kavala on the Aegean, and most of the southern half of Macedonia was, until 1912, at least as 'Turkish' as most of Anatolia.

Early Ottoman architecture in the Balkans

Ottoman architecture in the Balkans largely followed the pattern of the settlement of Turks as outlined above. As the incorporation of the southern Balkans, Thrace and Macedonia took place at a time when the young state was still in its formative stage, these provinces fully participated in the formation of the new Islamic art. It is not generally known that in the southern Balkans today there are still standing at least a dozen buildings dating from the very first

⁵³ Halil İnalçık, *Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1954).

⁵⁴ Selami Pulaha, *Le cadastre de l'an 1485 du sandjak de Shkoder. Presentation, introduction, translittération, traduction et commentaire*, 2 vols. (Tirana, 1974).

decades of Ottoman rule, that is, from before the year 1400. These are not converted Byzantino-Slavic structures, but genuine Ottoman ones, including mosques, *zaviyes* (dervish lodges), *hamams* and *hans* (caravansarys). As they remain very little known, they will be introduced here briefly. The line of development will also be described beyond the fourteenth century, bringing the story to 1453.

Problems of conservation

The value and the beauty of the Ottoman architectural legacy in south-eastern Europe has long been unappreciated in the nation-states succeeding the empire. After 1878, and especially after 1912, the Ottoman monuments became the victims of mass destruction, being memories of a past which had no place in the nationalist ideology and education of the successor states. Because of the tendency to 'correct the mistake of history' (the emergence and existence of the Ottoman Empire) objects directly recalling that time had to be removed. In fact, this process went on until the 1990s: the Cultural Revolution in Albania in 1967, the anti-Turkish and Islamic campaign of the Živkov regime in Bulgaria, 1984–5, the mass destruction, with the help of dynamite, of a long list of many-centuries-old Ottoman buildings in Bosnia-Herzegovina by the nationalist Serbs as well as Croats, and most recently the destruction of whole old town centres by Serbian incendiary squads during the Kosovo crisis of 1998–9 (Djakovica, Vučitrn, Peć). The events in the summer of 2001 in the Republic of Macedonia, which led to the wanton destruction of scores of historical mosques by Macedonian extremists, show how fragile the situation still is.

On the other hand, at least since the beginning of the twentieth century, the more enlightened part of Balkan society has raised its voice against these acts of destruction, and succeeded in saving individual buildings here and there.

Illustrative of this is the case of the monumental, late fifteenth-century *bedestan* (covered market) in the city centre of Serres in Greek Macedonia, which in the Second World War was under Bulgarian occupation. In the process of being demolished, the *bedestan* was saved by the direct personal intervention of the art historian Bogdan Filov, prime minister of the fascist government of Bulgaria, and later carefully restored by the Greek Service for Ancient Monuments. It now serves as the city's Archaeological Museum.⁵⁵ A different case is that of the similarly late fifteenth-century *bedestan* of Yambol

⁵⁵ The role of Bogdan Filov in the saving of the Serres *bedestan* was communicated to us by a participant of the Bulgarian occupation of Macedonia in the Second World War, Nikola Mushanov.

in Bulgarian Thrace, the only Bulgarian example of its kind surviving to our time. When in the 1960s the town centre of Yambol was reconstructed, the city council wanted to demolish the, admittedly ugly, ruin of the building. Others wanted to preserve it as a relic in a steel and glass 'aquarium'; and the gifted architect Nikola Mushanov made a model showing a total reconstruction of the building. The city council pressed for a solution. Finally the party secretary, himself a poet, chose the Mushanov plan, and made available the huge amount of money needed. As the town and the whole district of Yambol had no other historical buildings, it was later decided to restore also the ugly-looking Old Mosque nearby. Since the 1980s both buildings, but in particular the *bedestan*, have become much appreciated beauty spots locally. When much money became available for restoration after the destructive Thessalonike earthquake of 20 June 1978, some Ottoman buildings in the city were restored with great care and attention by architects and specialists of the Greek National Service for Historical Monuments. The restorations of two very large, richly decorated and monumental fifteenth-century *hamams*, the Bey Hamamı and the Pazar Hamamı, are among the best of their type ever undertaken.

The dichotomy in attitude towards the Ottoman legacy in the Balkans is made very clear in the case of Skopje, the capital of the former Yugoslav Macedonia. After the catastrophic earthquake of 1963 ten of the largest Ottoman buildings, almost all from the fifteenth century, were excellently restored or even reconstructed. They all stand together around the bazaar area, in what was to become an architectural preserve, a protected cityscape. However, everything else, including more than a dozen historical mosques, a number of the fifteenth-century *hamams*, *türbes* (tombs) and *tekkes* (dervish lodges), was mercilessly destroyed so that the modern socialist capital of the Macedonian Slav state could be constructed.⁵⁶ Skopje as it looks today is the outcome of the long struggle between two antagonistic forces.

The aspect of the wholesale destruction of the Ottoman architectural legacy, amounting to 98 per cent of all historical public and religious buildings, should constantly be kept in mind when evaluating the place this art once occupied in the formation and flourishing of Ottoman art as a whole.

⁵⁶ These actions were, according to a communication made to us by the post-communist prime minister of Macedonia, Branko Červenkovski, pushed forward by the influential head of the city's Institute for Historical Monuments, the *betonkopf* communist Alexander Kanev, who more than anyone else is responsible for the disappearance of scores of Ottoman monuments in this singularly rich city.

The fourteenth century

The needs of the early conquerors and settlers for places of prayer must at first have been satisfied by confiscating Christian churches, which at the same time became the symbols of the victory of Islam. Early examples are the Süleyman Paşa Camii in Ferecik (Feraï) and the Fatih Camii in Vize, both in Thrace and both sizeable middle-Byzantine buildings. In the capital of the Ottoman Balkans, Edirne (Adrianople), conquered around 1369, at least two churches were converted into mosques, the Kilise Cami and the Fatih Camii. They served as the chief mosques of the city until the construction of the first Great Mosque (now known as Eski Cami), begun shortly after 1403 by Emir Süleyman. The two church/mosques of Edirne disappeared long ago as a consequence of earthquake and fire. In towns taken without violence, such as Komotini, or the great city of Serres, and in newly founded towns the Ottomans had to construct their own buildings themselves.

The oldest Ottoman buildings still standing in the Balkans are very probably the Gazi Evrenos İmareti (soup kitchen) and the nearby Eski Cami of Gümülcine (Komotini) in Greek Thrace. The *hamam*, which had an Arabic inscription and was blown up in the early 1960s, was part of the same foundation. From the surviving buildings, the Eski Cami is a building which has no preserved inscription but can be dated by historical evidence. Gümülcine, a very small Byzantine fortified town, was taken by Gazi Evrenos, presumably in 1361, and became the seat of his *uc* facing Serbian-controlled Aegean Macedonia. It is not very likely that the early Ottoman warlords started to invest in building before the battle on the Maritsa (Meriç) in 1371 had removed the Serbian threat. In 1383, when Serres, the key of Aegean Macedonia, was conquered,⁵⁷ Evrenos moved the seat of his *uc* to that important place 130 kilometres to the west, and closer to the main field of operations. In Serres he is known to have constructed another *imaret/zaviye*. The *vakfiye* (endowment deed of a *vakıf*) of this foundation is dated 818 (13 March 1415–end February 1416),⁵⁸ but the building is evidently older (Evrenos Bey died at a great age in 1416). It is interesting to see that in the *vakfiye* the person who ran the Serres institution is explicitly called 'Ahi'. In the early 1390s Evrenos Bey moved westward again, this time to the new town of Yenice-i Vardar, 50 kilometres west of Thessalonike, after the latter had been taken by the Ottomans in 1387. Yenice-i Vardar is a creation of Gazi Evrenos. It is the town where he erected

57 For the date of the conquest of these two cities see George Ostrogorski, 'La prise de Serres par les Turcs', *Byzantion* 35 (1965), 302–19; G. T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Paleologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387* (Rome, 1960); and Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 33–4.

58 Ankara Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi, Defter 2108, ff. 72–7.

a number of Islamic buildings and the place where he died and was buried. Some of his works in Yenice still survive today.⁵⁹ The years between 1371 and 1383 are thus the most likely for the Gümülcine buildings, between 1383 and 1390 for that in Serres and the last decade of the fourteenth century for the works in Yenice-i Vardar.

The Evrenos İmareti in Gümülcine is a good representative of the *zaviye*-T-plan mosque which can better be called a *hanekah* (dervish lodge), or *zaviye* (dervish lodge). It does not face towards Mecca, and is composed of a sizeable rectangular hall, covered by a dome on a network of Turkish triangles and by a barrel vault over the remaining part. The hall opens up towards the east with a huge arch of soft yellow-green limestone, emphasising the entrance, the remainder of the work being made up of a cloisonné of bricks and broken stone. The central hall is flanked on both sides by transversely placed rectangular side rooms which are accessible only from the central hall by means of a door, framed by fine portals. The one on the left (south) side has a large Arabic inscription, calligraphed and cut into the arched tympanon above the actual entrance, the whole being a part of the authentic structure and not a work of the recent restoration. The inscription is evidently the 'Bauinschrift' of Gazi Evrenos's time but it is illegible, having been mutilated by the Bulgarian conquerors of 1912, who identified the building as a genuine old-Bulgarian church, 'reconverted' it into a church and dedicated it to the Holy Tsar Boris-Michael. The letters of Gazi Evrenos's inscription were cut away to be replaced with a Cyrillic inscription. The modern Greek restorers carefully cleaned the remains of the original inscription which remains, alas, for the greater part illegible. It is the oldest monument of Ottoman epigraphy in south-eastern Europe. Against previously held theories, the building never had a domed or arched porch. When, during the restoration, the ugly concrete machinery halls were removed (before the restoration the building had served as the town's power station) and archaeological research was carried out, no trace of a portico of any type was found. The form the original building had, and now has again, ranks it with the early fourteenth-century, pre-Ottoman *zaviyes* like those in Tokat, rather than associating it with the earliest Ottoman *zaviye*-mosques such as Orhan Gazi's in Bursa (1335). The Gümülcine plan is also partly related to the Nilüfer İmareti in İznik (1388), especially the rectangular, partly domed, partly arched lateral guest rooms. Like Gümülcine, the İznik building does

59 See M. Kiel, 'Yenice-i Vardar (Vardar Yenicesi – Giannitsa): a Forgotten Turkish Cultural Centre in Macedonia of the 15th and 16th Century', *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica* 3 (1971), 300–55; more easily available in M. Kiel, *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (Aldershot, 1990).

not face towards Mecca. The link between the early *zaviyes* in Tokat and the Gümülcine building is indirect. The direct link is missing, but must have been formed by buildings which have now disappeared.⁶⁰ A hint of the real nature of this and other buildings (Serres) within this group is given in the survey of staff, income and expenditure of the Gümülcine building contained in the register from 858/1454–5. The most important and best paid member of the staff is called an ‘Ahi’, thus a member of the famous late Seljuk and early Ottoman brotherhood of the *ahis*.⁶¹ The Eski Cami of Gümülcine is preserved in a much altered and enlarged form. It stands slightly east of the *imaret* and consists of an original fourteenth-century domed cube with an inner space of 7.80 metres which in the nineteenth century was enlarged by a spacious addition, enveloping it on most of its three sides. The original entrance wall was then removed to join both old and new sections; a building inscription over the door was lost in the process. The building was evidently designed as a *mescid* (small mosque) in the manner of many other single-domed prayer chapels, as preserved in their dozens in old towns such as Afyon or Ayasoluğ/Selçuk and elsewhere in Anatolia. Both Gümülcine buildings are closely linked by their plans with contemporaneous structures in Anatolia, from where the inspiration came. They are built, however, using the late Byzantine cloisonné technique, then in vogue in the southern Balkans as well as in north-western and Aegean Anatolia, where we can assume the participation of local masters.⁶² The oldest preserved Ottoman utilitarian building in the Balkans also goes back to Gazi Evrenos. It is the *han* near the mineral springs of Ilıca (‘Trajanopolis),

60 For the Tokat *zaviyes* see the excellent work of Sedat Emir, *Erken Osmanlı Mimariğinde Çok-İşlevli Yapılar: Kentsel Kolonizasyon Yapıları Olarak Zaviyeler*, vol. II: *Öncül Yapıları Tokat Zaviyeleri* (İzmir, 1994). For the *zaviye*-mosque see also the influential article of Semavi Eyice, ‘İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini-İçtimai Bir Müessesesi: Zaviyeler ve Zaviyeli Camiler’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 22, 1–2 (1962–3), 1–80.

61 İstanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi, Cevdet Yazmaları collection, no. 0.89. For this brotherhood and its role see ‘Akhi’, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2006) [henceforth *El2*], 1, pp. 321–3 (Franz Taeschner), or Ziya Kazıcı, ‘Ahilik’, in *TDVİA*, vol. 1 (İstanbul, 1988), pp. 540–2. For more details see Neşet Çağatay, *Bir Türk Kurumu olan Ahilik* (Ankara, 1974).

62 For both buildings of Gazi Evrenos in Komotini see M. Kiel, ‘Observations on the History of Northern Greece during the Turkish Rule: Historical and Architectural Description of the Turkish Monuments of Komotini and Serres, their Place in the Development of Ottoman Turkish Architecture and their Present Condition’, *Balkan Studies* 12 (1971), 415–44; and Kiel, ‘The Oldest Monuments of Ottoman-Turkish Architecture in the Balkans: the İmaret of Gazi Evrenos in Gümülcine (Komotini) and the Evrenos Bey Khan in the Village of Ilıca/Loutro in Greek Thrace (1370–1390)’, *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 12 (1983), 117–38. See also the report on the inspired restoration of the building by the men who undertook it: Charalambos Bakirtsis and Pantelis Xidas, ‘İmaret. Komotini, Greece’, in *Secular Medieval Architecture in the Balkans, 1300–1500, and its Preservation*, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjithrionos (Thessalonike, 1997), pp. 294–5.

15 kilometres east of the modern Greek port of Alexandropolis, on the road to İpsala on the Turkish side of the Maritsa (Evros) river. The *han* is a spacious, barrel-vaulted, rectangular hall with fireplaces along the southern wall. This hall is preceded by a closed entrance room, now largely ruined. As a type it is closely related to a whole group of *hans* from the Beylik period in Anatolia. The institution of *han* or caravansary was unknown to Byzantino-Slavic architecture. An inscription, mentioning the name of Gazi Evrenos as its founder, existed, until the collapse of the façade in 1940, above the entrance and was mentioned by the local historian A. Samothrakis.⁶³ The early seventeenth-century historian of Edirne, Hibri Efendi, described it and also attributes it to Gazi Evrenos. It must have been constructed some decades after Evrenos's buildings in Gümülcine, thus in the 1390s.⁶⁴

The oldest representative of commemorative architecture is apparently the *türbe*, mausoleum, attributed to Lala Şahin Paşa in Kazanlâk. It lies on a spur of the Balkan mountains, overlooking the town of Kazanlâk in Bulgarian Thrace. This town figures as Akçe Kazanlık in the early Ottoman chronicles of the conquest of the Balkans, and appears as a small, purely Turkish settlement in the oldest preserved Ottoman registers for this part of Thrace. The building is an early example of the open canopy *türbe* with a dome resting on four brick-built pointed arches and four square pillars, likewise of brick. Lala Şahin, the first Ottoman *beylerbey* of Rumeli, died shortly after 1383. His body was buried in his still-standing *türbe* in Kirmasti (now Mustafa Kemal Paşa) 70 kilometres west of Bursa.⁶⁵ His bowels must have been buried in the hill above Kazanlâk, most probably the place where he died. The name of the building was handed down by tradition among the Muslim inhabitants and recorded by Franz Babinger in the 1930s. An interesting early parallel to the habit of burying the intestines of an important person on the spot where he died and preparing (or mummifying) his body for the long transport to his desired burial place is handed down in the chronicle of the so-called Serbian janissary, Konstantin of Ostrović, who had entered Ottoman service in 1455, after Mehmed II's capture of the Serbian silver-mine town of Novobrd on the

63 A. Samothrakis, in *Thrakika Chronika* 18 (1943). A large fragment of this inscription was found recently and is now kept in the Archaeological Museum of Kavalla. In the text it is mentioned that Evrenos Bey was a *hacı*. It is known from early Ottoman chronicles that Evrenos Bey asked Bayezid I for permission to go on *hac* in 1396. The building was thus constructed in the last years of the fourteenth century. The important text of the inscription is to be published by Heath Lowry.

64 For this building see Kiel, 'Observations' and Kiel, 'The Oldest Monuments'; and Heath W. Lowry, *The Shaping of the Ottoman Balkans 1350–1550* (Istanbul, 2008), pp. 29–35.

65 See Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri 630–805 (1230–1402)*, vol. I (Istanbul, 1966), pp. 190–7, with good plans and photographs.

edge of the plain of Kosovo. This source notes that, after the battle of Kosovo in 1389, 'Sultan Bayezid, after having been victorious, remained on the plain of Kosovo and erected there, on the battlefield, over the site where his father was killed, a monument: on four columns a dome was made and was covered with lead, and this stands till the present day.'⁶⁶ The Serbian janissary probably passed this monument when on campaign before 1463, when he was taken prisoner by King Matthias Corvinus, before finally settling in Poland, or knew it from his youth as he was born in the close vicinity of the monument. The same story, in different wording, is found in the fifteenth-century Ottoman chronicle the Anonymous-Giese where, after the description of the battle of Kosovo, the author states: 'Then they built on the side where he fell a *türbe* and made the place visible. Even now this *türbe* remains on this site. Then they transported his body to Kaplıca [suburb of Bursa, where Murad's principal buildings are located] and buried it there.'⁶⁷ The *türbe* was later replaced by a more monumental structure. The one we still see today was made on the order of Sultan Mehmed Reşad, a year before the end of Ottoman rule in the Balkans (1911). When Sultan Süleyman died before Szeged in 1566, the same procedure was followed, the *türbe* later being surrounded by a garden and a *zaviye* added to it. Süleyman's body was buried in Istanbul, as is known; that of Murad I in Bursa in a monumental *türbe*. The practice is definitely older, and must be connected to the pronounced ancestor cult of the Turkic people, in the case of Kazanlı and Kosovo, visibly transported to the Balkans.⁶⁸

Among the very early dated Ottoman single-domed mosques ranks the Eski Cami in Kırkkilise in Turkish Thrace. It is a cube covered by a dome over an

66 Konstantin of Ostrovič, *Memoiren eines Janitscharen: oder Türkische Chronik*, trans. Renate Lachmann (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1975), p. 82.

67 Giese, *Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken*, p. 38.

68 On the practice of mummifying see Faruk Sümer, 'The Seljuk Turbeks and the Tradition of Embalming', in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca* (Naples, 1965), pp. 245–8. For the wider background, V. Barthold and M. J. Rogers, 'Burial Rites of Turks and Mongols', *Central Asian Journal* 19 (1970), 195–227. On Kazanlı and Lala Şahin see Franz Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.–15. Jahrhundert)* (Brno, Munich and Vienna, 1944), pp. 67, 72–4, which includes a rich bibliography; Franz Babinger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geschlechtes der Malkoç-oglu's', in his *Aufsätze und Anhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, vol. I (Munich, 1962), pp. 355 ff. and illustr. 44, giving the pre-war situation of the Kazanlı monument. For a recent photograph see M. Kiel, 'Osmanische Baudenkmäler in Südosteuropa, Typologie und Verhältniss zur Lokalen Kunst – Probleme der Erhaltung in den heutigen Nationalstaaten', in *Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die Osmanen*, ed. Hans Georg Majer (Munich, 1989), p. 59. In July 1998 the condition of the monument had largely remained the same. The *türbe* of Murad I on Kosovo Polje was recently superbly restored with help from Turkey. See the fine publication of Mehmed İbrahimgil and Neval Konuk, *Kosova Sultan Murad Hüdavendigâr Türbesi* (Ankara, 2005).

inner space of 12.25 metres, the dome resting on a belt of Turkish triangles. The original inscription is lost but one recording a major repair mentions Hızır Bey, an early member of the well-known Mihaloğlu family, as founder, and 785/1383–4 as the date of construction.⁶⁹ The early Ottomans quickly developed the small, cubic single-domed *mescids* they had inherited from the Seljuks into Friday mosques (the Cami mosques) of much more monumental proportions and artistic pretensions. It was this type which became very popular in the Balkans, in most places the embodiment of all that was regarded as ‘Ottoman’ and in most cases the sole representative of this style. Gazi Evrenos’s single-domed building in Gümülcine was doubtlessly conceived as a *mescid*. The Eski Cami of Serres, originally also a single-domed building, was definitely a mosque from the beginning, as stated in its building inscription. It was the largest mosque of the city for more than a century, until 1492, when the huge mosque of Mehmed Bey, the son of the famous Gedik Ahmed Paşa, was built.

The Eski Cami of Serres was demolished in 1938 but old photographs and the topographical plan of the city from the inter-war period, as well as a description by Evliya Çelebi, give enough data to reconstruct it. It was a foundation of the conqueror of the city, grand *vezir* Çandarlı Hayreddin Paşa, who erected it between 1383, the year in which the city was taken, and 1387, the year of his death, just outside the city walls of Byzantine Serres. As a building it appears to be closely related to Hayreddin’s more famous creation, the Yeşil Cami in İznik, the seat of the Çandarlı family.

Evliya Çelebi gives the date of its completion as 787/1385 and describes it as the first mosque of the city. It was a rectangular prayer hall covered by one large dome of nearly ten metres span, and, as in İznik, by three vaults resting on two pillars. It was preceded by a domed porch. This solution reminds us of the narthex and exo-narthex of the middle Byzantine churches and might indeed be a creative reinterpretation of it. In the eighteenth century the building was enlarged on both lateral sides, and a second porch was added. Soon after its initial construction the Eski Cami was to become the focal point of the city. More than a century after its construction Çandarlı İbrahim Paşa constructed the six-domed *bedestan* of Serres just opposite the mosque of his great ancestor, and thus became the focal point of the city’s economic life. The old Byzantine town, however, with its dozens of churches, became largely a residential area,

69 For this mosque and its inscription see Mehmet Tuncel, *Babaeski, Kırklareli ve Tekirdağ Camileri* (Ankara, 1974), pp. 23–5; Özcan Mert, ‘Kırklareli Kitâbeleri’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* 25 (1971), 155–62.

where the Christians continued to live. The Serres *bedestan* has managed to survive until today, as has been mentioned above.⁷⁰

At first sight the important Eski Cami of the town of Yambol on the Tunca (Tundža) river in Bulgarian Thrace appears to be an early endeavour to develop the plan of an Ottoman great mosque of the kind of the Üç Şerefeli in Edirne. In fact it is the work of two different building campaigns, as became visible during its restoration when an ugly coat of nineteenth-century plaster was taken off. The building is very early. Yambol, the Byzantino-Bulgarian border town of Diampolis, was conquered by the Ottomans in the summer of 1370. It capitulated after a long siege. The small and very strongly walled town in a loop of the Tunca must have been left as it was. It was still defensible when in 1412 Musa Çelebi attacked it. After that date the town walls must have been left to decay and disappear slowly, as was the case in Serres, and in other places where they were no longer needed. The Ottomans constructed their early buildings in the open plain to the north of the old town. The most important is the Eski Cami, of which the nucleus reaches back to the 1370s or 1380s. This part of the building is a good example of a single-domed mosque with engaged pillars. These pillars, connected by heavy, pointed arches, reduce the space which needed to be covered by the dome, but at the same time create a richer and wider inner space. The direct forerunner of this type of mosque seems to be the mosque of Koca Yedigâr in the town of İnönü near Eskişehir in western Anatolia, said to date from 776/1374. An older, slightly larger and more convincing example is the mosque of Orhan Bey in Eski Bilecik, an undated building but certainly constructed before the death of this second ruler of the house of Osman (1362). Both the Bilecik and İnönü buildings have no porch. Yambol, however, has a massive and monumental porch with closed flanks and an arcade covered by crossvaults resting on three arches carried by two square pillars. It is a solution which we also encounter in some thirteenth-century Seljuk *mescids* in Konya. To the right of the entrance rises a curious square minaret, the only one known in the Balkans, but rather common in south-eastern Anatolia, in the art of the various Turkoman beyliks, and clearly connected with the Syrian prototype. Locally the minaret was long held to be the tower of the old Bulgarian cathedral of Yambol but archaeological research

70 A number of old photographs of the Serres Eski Cami as it was in the first decades of the twentieth century were published by G. Kaftantzis, *Οί Σέρρες άλλοτε και τώρα. Αφιέρωμα*, (Thessalonike, 1985). See also Th. Pennas, *Ιστορία των Σερρών, από της άλώσεως αυτών από των Τούρκων μέχρι της απελευθερώσεώς των από των Ελλήνων*, 1383–1913, 2nd edn (Athens, 1966). For the functioning of the *vakıf* of this mosque see the useful work of Balta, *Les vakıfs de Serres*, pp. 91–5.

underneath the floor of the mosque found no trace of such an imagined building.

Many decades later, owing to the rapid expansion of the Muslim population of the town (the 1454–5 register mentions 591 adult Muslim males but only 56 adult male Christians)⁷¹ and perhaps inspired by the great Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne (1437–48), the Yambol mosque was enlarged on two sides by three large units on each side, covered by cradle vaults. In this manner a building was created which evidently belongs to the same group as the great Edirne mosque.⁷²

From all the works erected by Gazi Evrenos in his residence, the new town of Yenice-i Vardar, only a large single *hamam* remains. It shows a complicated plan with a profusion of domes on belts of elaborate Turkish triangles but does not have the later obligatory tripartite layout. Like some other early Ottoman *hamams*, or those from the second half of the fourteenth century in the west Anatolian princely residences of Ayasoluğ and Balat, it has no large disrobing room. The Yenice-i Vardar building has been a ruin for decades, but is protected by law against demolition. It is not dated but has to be placed in the 1390s. In that decade Evrenos had moved his seat again and created a new town, probably on the site of a small Byzantine castle (the name Yenice does not mean new, but newish). His foundations there consisted of a mosque, an *imaret*, a great *medrese* (school) and the preserved *hamam*. His buildings are described by Evliya Çelebi and are mentioned in the various *tahrir defters* of the sixteenth century. Gazi Evrenos's *türbe*, near the *hamam*, survived in the form of an early twentieth-century reconstruction. The building inscription, mentioning the death of the old warlord in 1417, was found some decades ago and was published by Vasili Demetriadis.⁷³

From the same time as Gazi Evrenos's buildings in Yenice-i Vardar, the last decade of the fourteenth century, are two buildings in the small central Bulgarian town of İhtiman. İhtiman was founded by members of the Mihaloğlu

71 İstanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi, Cevdet Yazmaları collection, no. O.89 (AH 859/1454–5).

72 For an older description of the Yambol Eski Cami see M. Kiel, 'Some Early Ottoman Monuments in Bulgarian Thrace, Stara Zagora, Jambol and Nova Zagora', *Belleten* 38, 152 (1974), 644–9; updated in Kiel, *Studies*, section VII. A detailed survey of the results of the great restoration of this building and the archaeological research underneath its floor has not been published. For Orhan Bey's mosque in Eski Bilecik and Koca Yedigir in İnönü see Aptullah Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture* (Chicago, 1968), p. 70, with plan and photograph.

73 For the history and the monuments of this town see Kiel, 'Yenice-i Vardar', pp. 300–29; also Kiel, *Studies*; Vasili Demetriadis, 'The Tomb of Ghazi Evrenos Bey at Yanitsa and its Inscription', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39 (1976), 328–32; and Lowry, *The Shaping of the Ottoman Balkans*, pp. 58–64.

family, three kilometres south of the Byzantino-Bulgarian town of Stipion (Stiponje), as the centre for a group of Turkish villages in this small highland valley which is surrounded on all sides by heavily wooded mountains but controls the main road from Edirne to Sofia and further on to Belgrade. After the conquest, Stipion long remained the largest, and purely Christian, settlement in the region. It was taken by treaty and the name İhtiman refers to this ('ahd ve aman'). The Mihaloğlu constructed an *imaret/zaviye* as focal point of the new settlement and nearby a *han* of the kind found in İlica (Trajanopolis) and a *hamam*. The tax revenues of the Turkish villages of the mountain plain, and that of Stipion, were endowed for the upkeep of the foundation. Its founder appears to be Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey, who fell in the battle of Ankara in 1402. The *imaret/zaviye*, for half a century in an incredible state of ruin, consists of a central domed space flanked by lateral rooms, also covered by domes, and a barrel-vaulted section which houses the *mihrab*. Originally the lateral spaces were closed and only opened to the central space through doors. In the course of the sixteenth century, when the old institution once housed in the building no longer existed, the separating walls were removed and the space incorporated to the functions of the mosque. To the right of the building, but disconnected, a very high minaret was added, the features of which betray its date. It disappeared after the First World War but is known from old photographs. The *han* opposite the *zaviye*-mosque disappeared in the nineteenth century. The *hamam*, however, is preserved and was excellently restored in the 1980s. The remarkable disrobing room is covered by a dome on an exceedingly high tambour, a characteristic feature of the early Ottoman dome and very probably related to the stilted domes of late Byzantine architecture. The plan of both buildings was evidently imported from Anatolia but the workmanship of the walls, with rosettes in brick and other ceramo-plastic elements, is related to the local architecture.⁷⁴ Related to the buildings in Gümülcine and İhtiman is the long misunderstood mosque of Yıldırım Bayezid in the westernmost suburb of Edirne. This building is, like that in Gümülcine and the older *zaviyes* in Tokat and elsewhere, not oriented towards Mecca. It was therefore thought to have been a Byzantine church of unknown type. It has also been interpreted as not being from Yıldırım Bayezid but from Murad I, thus decades older, on the grounds that Edirne had no sultanic mosque. That at least two large ex-churches served as mosques, as is related by Hibri and Evliya Çelebi,

74 For this building see Semavi Eyice, 'Sofya Yakınında İhtiman'da Gazi Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey İmareti-Camii', *Kubbealtı Akademî Mecmuası* 4, 2 (1975), 49–61. For the town and its district see M. Kiel, 'İhtiman' in *TDVİA*, vol. XVIII (İstanbul, 1999), vol. XXI (2000), pp. 571–2.

was overlooked. The building is traditionally called Yıldırım Cami, or, more revealing, Eski İmaret, to distinguish it from the Orta İmaret of Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey and the great Yeni İmaret of Bayezid II, likewise on the banks of the Tunca. It is also mentioned in some fifteenth-century account books of great sultanic foundations, showing a staff including two cooks, one baker, one dishwasher, a cellar-master and a rice pounder for the food distributed in the building.⁷⁵ Moreover, its original inscription from 1399–1400, preserved broken into several pieces and kept in the Edirne Archaeological Museum (Inv. No. 1537), calls the building an *imaret*, not a mosque.⁷⁶ The plan shows a central dome on the intersection of four barrel-vaulted *eyvans* (recesses open on one side). Two of the remaining corners are filled with detached rooms, furnished with chimneys and opening to the main building through doors. They were evidently the guest rooms. In front of the building, on the northern side, there once ran a porch of five units of which only the columns are still standing. Outside the building are the ruins of the kitchen building, with one huge chimney still standing. Only at a much later date was this original *zaviye*, called *imaret* in the inscription, transformed into a mosque proper, with the addition of a minaret and a *mihrab* obliquely placed in a corner of the southern *eyvan* in order to show the correct orientation to Mecca.

Another building that has long puzzled art historians is the curious mosque of Çelebi Sultan Mehmed (1413–21) in the small town of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka). This town was conquered before Edirne and had long received special treatment from the Ottoman sultans. Mehmed the Conqueror and Bayezid II were born in the palace of Dimetoka and in the fifteenth century the imperial treasure was kept there. The great mosque which still overlooks the town was begun by Yıldırım Bayezid before 1402 but completed much later by his youngest son, Mehmed I. The Ottoman registers from the late fifteenth century onward call it the mosque of Sultan Yıldırım Han, as do Evliya Çelebi and the Ottoman accounts of the İmaret-i Bayezidiye in Edirne.⁷⁷ The Dimetoka mosque was conceived as an enlarged version of the Şehadet Cami in the castle of Bursa, a work of Murad I, with two large domes resting on two massive piers over the central ‘nave’ and two mighty cradle vaults on each of

75 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, ‘Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları’, *Belgeler* 1, 2 (1964), 235–377 (for the Bayezidiye İmaret, pp. 291–3).

76 For this important inscription see the scholarly edition by F. Th. Dijkema, *The Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne* (Leiden, 1977), pp. 13–15 and plate 1.

77 Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahat-namesi*, vol. VIII (Istanbul, 1928), p. 75. See Barkan, ‘Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin’, p. 292.

the remaining lateral sections.⁷⁸ When the walls had reached their full height Bayezid was defeated by Timur at the battle of Ankara (1402), and the building remained unfinished. Almost two decades later Sultan Mehmed I finished the work in a different and much cheaper manner than originally intended. As he had already completed the huge Eski Cami of Edirne, left unfinished by his brothers Süleyman and Musa, and was still working on the very expensive Yeşil Cami in Bursa, he evidently had to economise. Instead of stone the entire vaulting was made of wood and covered by a huge, lead-covered, pyramid roof. The woodwork, already described by Evliya in 1669, is not the product of later repairs but dates from 1420–2, as was shown by dendrochronological research by Striker and Kuniholm. In the long and elaborate inscriptions over the entrances only Mehmed is mentioned as founder, as he is in the inscriptions of the Edirne Eski Cami. The provisional character of Mehmed's work in Dimetoka can also be seen in the fact that the mosque never had a *vakıf* of its own. Its staff were paid from the poll-tax of the Christians of the *kaza* of Dimetoka.⁷⁹ In spite of this, the Dimetoka mosque remains one of the largest architectural enterprises of the Ottomans in the Balkans outside the capitals Bursa and Edirne. It is also the first building in the Balkans with an inscription where the architect mentions himself. This is the well-known Hacı İvaz Paşa of Tokat, the architect of the famous Yeşil Cami in Bursa. It is thus an undeniable document of the way Ottoman architecture was introduced into the Balkans from Anatolia. The building now has no function but is maintained by the Greek Service for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Antiquities, Kavalla.⁸⁰ The little Thracian town has more early Ottoman buildings, mostly very little known but still standing. One of them is the so-called Fısıltı Hamamı, or Whispering Bath, a foundation of Uruç Paşa, one of the sons of Timurtaş, the second *beylerbey* of Rumeli.⁸¹ Hibri Efendi in the 1630s, and Katip Çelebi and Evliya Çelebi some decades later, mention this *hamam*. Hibri Efendi, who himself had worked at the *medrese* of Uruç Paşa, gives the date of construction of this early example of an Ottoman *hamam* in the Balkans as 801/September 1398–September 1399. Like other early Ottoman *hamams* it has no great domed disrobing room, and never had one, as can be seen on the finely worked

78 See Ayverdi's reconstruction in Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri 806–855 (1403–1451)*, vol. II (Istanbul, 1972) pp. 136–50. The inscriptions of this building are also given here in detail.

79 See references in various Vazifehoran Defters in the BOA (i.a. MAD 5625 from 1047–1637, p. 4; also MAD 6177 from 1046).

80 For the town in the Ottoman period see M. Kiel, 'Dimetoka' in *TDVİA*, vol. IX (1994), pp. 305–8.

81 Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i 'Osmânî*, vol. I (Istanbul, AH 1308), pp. 422–3.

stalactite portal. Instead of a great domed entrance hall it has a very elaborate tepidarium. At present this once important building is a miserable ruin.⁸²

The second early Ottoman building is the *türbe* of Uruç Paşa, situated on a hill to the north-east of the town, the site of the former Ottoman cemetery. It is another example of an open canopy *türbe*, a dome with four pointed arches, resting on four masonry piers. In contrast to the Kazanlâk *türbe* of Lala Şahin it is made entirely of carefully cut grey limestone, which abounds in the Dimetoka area. The identification of this *türbe* as the mausoleum of Uruç Paşa is handed down by tradition and fixed in the late Ottoman *salnames* of the Edirne Vilayet of 1310/1892.⁸³ Both Hibri and Evliya mention him as the founder of an important *medrese* in Dimetoka, a building ranking high in the hierarchy of *medreses* and mentioned as such in the official list of *medreses* of the Balkans from 1660.⁸⁴ Well-known Ottoman scholars like Taşköprüzade and Dülgerzade taught at this college. The *türbe* of Uruç Paşa is partly in ruins but is a protected monument.

One of the most important early Ottoman single-domed mosques, the focal point of the city, is the Eski Cami in the Bulgarian city of Stara Zagora (Zağra Eskihisar) in northern Thrace. The Byzantino-Bulgarian town, still lying within its far too wide ceinture of Roman walls, was captured by Lala Şahin, apparently in 1369–70. Its conquest is mentioned by most early Ottoman chroniclers but their dates are incorrect. It was taken together with Filibe (Plovdiv) and Yambol. This can hardly have been before the conquest of Edirne, which traditionally was placed in 1361, but after new research has to be placed around 1369. In 1408, during the troubled period of civil war between the sons of Bayezid I at the time of the reign of Emir Süleyman, a nobleman of the vanquished Aydınoğlu dynasty, Hamza Bey, the brother of İzmiroğlu Cüneyd, constructed this huge mosque at Zağra Eskihisar. Its prayer room is covered by one single dome on squinches, which has a diameter of more than 17 metres. This is a remarkable feat of engineering. The usual Byzantino-Bulgarian dome over thirteenth- and fourteenth-century churches hardly reached five metres. The space covered by Hamza Bey's dome is thus more than ten times larger. The hall is preceded by a curious porch with domes and vaults on square brick piers. The whole is extremely heavy and ponderous. As to plan and concept, this mosque is clearly related to the mosque of Yıldırım Bayezid in Mudurnu,

82 For details see M. Kiel, 'Two Monuments of Early and Classical Ottoman Architecture in Greek Thrace', *Balkan Studies* 22 (1981), 127–46, reproduced in Kiel, *Studies*.

83 *Salname* of the Edirne Vilayet 1310/1892, p. 340/1.

84 Published by M. Kemal Özergin, 'Eski Bir Rûznâme'ye Göre Rumeli Medreseleri', *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 4/5 (1974), 263, 290.

built in 1388, when he was residing there as a prince. An earlier example of a huge single-domed mosque is that of Ahmed Gazi, the Menteşe prince, in Eski Çine, built not in 1308, as is sometimes said, but around 1370, when he was the actual ruler of the little principality. The domes of the Mudurnu and Eski Çine mosques are even slightly bigger than that of Zağra Eskihişar but the latter is evidently a further development of the two works in western Anatolia, less heavy, more harmonious, but still a little primitive.

In a long Arabic inscription Hamza Bey proudly styled himself 'Shadow of God on Earth', which is a part of the title of a ruler and evidently a hint at his princely background. When Mehmed I reunited the empire, after 1413, such use of titles would no longer have been possible. In the imposing Zağra Eskihişar mosque Hamza Bey showed the same pretensions. The mosque was carefully restored in the early 1980s, but in 1985, during the anti-Islamic persecution campaign of the late Živkov regime, the minaret was blown up. Shortly afterwards the ornamental half-moon at the top of the great dome, symbol of Islam, was cut off. Since then the mosque stands, castrated.⁸⁵

At the time when Hamza Bey, Aydınoğlu prince in Ottoman service, was conceiving his mosque in Zağra Eskihişar, the ruler of Rumeli, Emir Süleyman, planned a truly sultanic great mosque in his capital, Edirne. By the beginning of 1403, Süleyman had secured his position in the Balkans with the treaty of Gallipoli, which he concluded with Byzantium, Genoa, Venice and the Knights of St John. In 1404 and 1405 he was busy fighting his brother Mehmed in Anatolia and in most of 1410 and the beginning of 1411 he was occupied with the struggle against his other brother Musa, in which he finally succumbed. Thus 1406–9 are the years in which he could actively push the construction of the great Edirne mosque. It was to be a smaller version of the Bursa Ulu Cami, with nine large domes (of more than 13 metres) on four massive square piers, instead of twenty domes on twelve piers, and practically continues the type of large multi-pillared mosques developed under the Seljuks. The Sungur Bey Mosque in Niğde (1330) constitutes the link between these and the earliest Ottoman creation of the same type, the Şehadet Mosque in Bursa, built sixty-five years after the Niğde building. In the literature, the Eski Cami of Edirne is often said to be the work of the architect Hacı Alaeddin of Konya, which would explain the link with Seljuk art. Yet his name does not figure on the two large historical inscriptions of the Edirne building.⁸⁶

85 For this building, mostly misdated in the older literature and attributed to the wrong founders, the most up-to-date source is M. Kiel, *Studies*, vii, pp. 635–654b.

86 G. T. Dennis, 'The Byzantine–Turkish Treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88. For the background of his rule see Elizabeth Zachariadou, 'Süleyman

The early Ottoman chronicles mention that Emir Süleyman was unable to finish the building and that it was continued by Musa, who in his short reign (1411–13) also failed to complete it. This was finally done under the triumphant Mehmed I in 1416, as is stated in the inscriptions. There Mehmed mentions only himself, omitting the role of his brothers, as he was also to do a few years later in Dimetoka.

Opposite the mosque Mehmed ordered the construction of a huge multi-domed covered market hall, a *bedestan*. It is the first of its kind known in the Balkans and together with the Great Mosque became the new city centre of Edirne, outside the walls of the old Adrianopolis. The Edirne *bedestan* was designed not only to become the focal point of commerce but also as a source of revenue for the *vakıf* of the new Ulu Cami. The accounts of this *vakıf*, from the late fifteenth century, as published by Barkan, show that it indeed was the foundation's largest source of income.⁸⁷ Both buildings are truly 'sultanic'. They demonstrated to all that the Turks felt confident of their hold on the Balkans, that they had come to stay.

The original design of the Edirne mosque had no porch and no minarets. One free-standing high minaret was added soon after by Murad II; the second one came much later, awkwardly improvised on the northern corner of the building. That the huge five-unit porch was added later, perhaps as a change of plans under Mehmed, can still be seen clearly.

Some architectural curiosities, rather than great monuments, must be mentioned briefly here, one in Larissa (Yenişehir) and one in Berat in southern Albania. After a fire in a pizzeria in the oldest part of the historic capital of Thessaly, Larissa, in central Greece, in February 1994, three well-preserved walls of a small (9 by 12 metre) single-domed mosque became visible. A reconstruction shows that the building belonged to the small group of Ottoman mosques which have an inner narthex, behind the usual open porch in front. The plan is related to the Yeşil Cami in İznik and its simpler brother in Serres, and a few other examples. Apart from an ugly and featureless mosque of the nineteenth century, Larissa, which once boasted more than forty mosques, now has none. The appearance of the remains of a clearly very old mosque created a local sensation.

The eastern Thessalian plain where Yenişehir was to arise was conquered by the Ottomans in 1386–7 under Gazi Evrenos, and the western plain, with Trikkala, in 1392–3 by Bayezid I. The eastern plain was largely depopulated

Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles', *Der Islam* 60 (1983), 268–96. For the two inscriptions on his Edirne mosque see Dijkema, *Inscriptions*, pp. 17 ff.

⁸⁷ Barkan, 'Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin', p. 299.

in the wars and depredations of the first half of the fourteenth century and Archbishop Antonios of Larissa (1333–63) was forced to reside in Trikkala, Larissa being totally ruined and his cathedral a refuge for robbers.⁸⁸ On flat ground below the ruins of the destroyed Byzantine town situated on the only hill of the eastern plain, at the point where the river Pineios can be bridged, the Ottomans under Evrenosoğlu Barak Bey were to found their new town, Yenişehir, which was to become one of the ten largest Ottoman cities of the Balkans, and until 1882 a city with a population that was more than three-quarters Muslim-Turkish. According to the *vakıf* section of the 1506 *tahrir defter* Barak Bey erected in Yenişehir a mosque and an *imaret*, which provided free food for travellers and the poor, as well as a *hamam* and rows of shops. Mosque and *imaret* were probably housed in one and the same building, known in the literature as a *zaviye*-mosque. Barak Bey is known to have been active in 1408, 1413 (in the decisive battle against Musa Çelebi) and in 1422 when he was involved in the blockading of Thessalonike.⁸⁹

Nothing survives from Barak Bey's foundations in Larissa. What has survived from his time, however, are the remains of a small, very well built mosque of one of the *kadis* of Yenişehir from the years around 1400. Only three walls of this mosque have come down to us, built in a very carefully executed cloisonné technique which links it to known Ottoman buildings from the last decade of the fourteenth and the first two decades of the fifteenth century. The site of the mosque was remembered locally as the place where once the Bayraklı Cami had stood, the mosque from which the sign was given that it was prayer time by flying a flag from the minaret. Until the 1994 fire the existence of the building remained wholly unknown. An Ottoman survey of the *vakıfs* of Thessaly from 1248/1833–4 makes clear that the Bayraklı Cami was the work of Kadı Musliheddin.⁹⁰ The date of the building has been 'read' by a number of experts on Ottoman architecture as ranging between 1390 and 1420, that is, the period of Evrenosoğlu Barak Bey. The remains of the building were cleaned and conserved by the local service for historical monuments but as of 2006 no further reconstruction work had been undertaken.

88 For Antonios see N. Bees, 'Zur Schriftstellerei des Antonios von Larissa', *Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher* 12 (1936), 315–16. For more detail see Stavros G. Gouloulis, *Ἀντωνίου Λαρίσσης Ἐγκώμιον εἰς ἄγιον Κυπριανὸν Λαρίσσης* (Larissa, 1991).

89 For Barak Bey see Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 61, 62, 94, referring to Venetian and contemporary Greek sources. A *vakfiye* of Barak's foundations in Larissa is apparently not preserved. For a detailed extract of it as it appears in the *tahrir defter* of 1506 see Kiel, 'Das türkische Thessalien', p. 98.

90 BOA, Evrak Nezareti 9442.

The historical city of Berat in southern Albania was annexed by the Ottomans (by whom it was named Arnavud Belgrad) in 1417. The Orthodox Christian walled city on the mountain top was left untouched. A new open Muslim city was to develop in the plain at the foot of the old town and no churches were confiscated. Only in the highest part of the old town, in the upper castle, was a small mosque constructed to serve the needs of the Ottoman garrison. The foundation walls from this building still stand, as does the greater part of the minaret. The latter is constructed in alternating layers of brick and stone according to the local Byzantine building traditions. The architectural concept, however, was imported from the east. The small mosque was named after Sultan Mehmed I and is the oldest in Albania.

Edirne has more remarkable buildings from the time when it was the capital of Rumeli. One of the best is the so-called Orta İmaret, or Gazi Mihal Camii, situated on the banks of the Tunca river, opposite the city, on the main road to Sofia and Belgrade. It is a good representative of the early Ottoman *zaviye*, designed to give accommodation and food to the traveller according to the ethics of the *ahi* brotherhood. It shows a more developed form than the buildings of the same category in Gümülcine, İhtiman and Yıldırım in Edirne. According to its preserved inscription it was built in 1422 by Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, one of the commanders of the Ottoman vanguard and an important figure in his time.

The building is composed of a domed central hall flanked by two closed lateral rooms equipped with chimneys and communicating with the central hall through doors. In the rear of the central hall is a barrel-vaulted space for prayer, with a *mihrab* in the axis of the building. In contrast to the older buildings of this kind, the Orta İmaret of Edirne is oriented towards Mecca. The building is preceded by a monumental porch of five units. Originally it had no minaret. This was awkwardly improvised much later on the left-hand corner of the building.

Old photographs, taken before the Second World War, show a separate kitchen building immediately to the left of the *zaviye*-mosque with its back to the river Tunca. It disappeared when the river dykes were made under the Menderes government.

The entire building, like most of those in Edirne, is made of neatly cut blocks of grey limestone. Although the building inscription gives the year 1422 as the date of construction, the building itself must be a decade older. Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey had been *beylerbey* of Rumeli under Musa Çelebi (1411–13) and was thus well positioned to erect a monumental and expensive building. After Mehmed I's victory over his brother in 1413, however, Mehmed

Bey was thrown into prison in Tokat and remained there until early in 1422, when, owing to his popularity among the troops of Rumeli, Murad II needed him in his attack against the pretender known as the Düzme (false) Mustafa.⁹¹ His Edirne buildings were completed in the year of his release. They were evidently begun earlier as half a year is far too short a period in which to build such a complicated structure. This would largely explain why this building has such an archaic feature as a barrel vault over the section reserved for prayer. In the inscription the building is called a 'blessed place' (*makam'l-mubarek*), not *cami*.⁹² On the opposite banks of the Tunca, sandwiched between the old and the new highways to Sofia and Belgrade, still stands the great double *hamam* of Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, in a shameful state of ruin but structurally sound. It is another example of a *hamam* without a great disrobing hall, following the Syrian plan, with a very elaborate tepidarium. The decoration of the vaults and domes of this *hamam* belongs to the richest Ottoman architecture has to offer. The great multi-arched stone bridge over the Tunca, connecting both of Mehmed Bey's buildings, is a work of the same person.

The oldest Ottoman Ulu Cami preserved in the Balkans outside the former capital of Edirne is the so-called Hüdavendigâr Murad Camii, or Cumaya Cami in Filibe (Plovdiv), the capital of Bulgarian Thrace and in early Ottoman times, until 1455–6, the seat of the *beylerbey* of Rumeli. This building, too, has been misdated in the existing literature, which focused on the title Hüdavendigâr, supposed to have been used only for Murad I (1362–89). In fact it is used throughout the fifteenth century, and even later, to denote the sultan.

The Cumaya Cami of Plovdiv is a further development of the theme of Ulu Cami and falls between the Ulu Cami of Bergama, from Bayezid I (1395), and the Eski Cami of Edirne. It has three spacious domes over a central 'nave', resting on four massive square piers, and has three large cradle vaults over both lateral spaces. It was once fronted by a porch of five domed units, which disappeared during an eighteenth-century earthquake and was replaced by a wooden penthouse. Traces of the domes became visible during the reconstruction of this penthouse in the 1970s. The springs of the pointed arches of the portico are still to be seen in the walls of both short sides of the porch, which are closed. The mosque has a tall minaret, adorned with an intricate pattern of rhombic fields, which is characteristic of the early fifteenth century.

91 Cf. Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 70, 92–3. The chronicler Aşıkpaşazade, then a young man, accompanied Mehmed Bey from Tokat to the battlefield at Ulubad (Lopadion), as he himself relates.

92 See Dijkema, *Inscriptions*. For the building see also Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 386–93.

The grand building has no original inscription. That which we see now refers to an eighteenth-century repair under Abdülhamid I.⁹³ Ottoman Filibe was destroyed in the summer of 1410 during the struggle between Emir Süleyman and his brother Musa Çelebi. The open town at the foot of the castle hill was burnt down but the upper town, with its walls, was apparently spared, as can be inferred from the text of Konstantin of Kostenets, the Bulgarian scholar and biographer of the Serbian ruler Stephen Lazarević.⁹⁴ During this event the surviving Greek Christian population left the town and settled in the nearby Stanimaki at the foot of the Rhodope mountains. Filibe was resettled with Muslim Turks. According to the oldest preserved Ottoman register concerning this town, Filibe then had 796 Muslim households, 78 of Christians and 33 of Gypsies.⁹⁵ The great Plovdiv mosque constitutes the heart of the open town. After Murad II had consolidated his rule, around 1425, he must have taken care of the reconstruction of Filibe, first of all building a new large Ulu Cami. The mosque is explicitly mentioned as his foundation by the well-informed Hibri Efendi, the local historian of early seventeenth-century Edirne, but his work long remained little known and preserved in only a few manuscripts.⁹⁶ The mosque had no *vakıf* of its own but was part of the large foundation for the maintenance of Murad II's buildings in Edirne, the Üç Şerefeli Mosque and the Muradiye, as is to be seen in the *vakıf* accounts published by Barkan, but which was overlooked by all who wrote about this building.⁹⁷

Important work of military architecture was also carried out under Murad II in Thessalonike. Immediately after the conquest of the city (1430), Murad's governor, Sungur Çavuş Bey, led the construction of the citadel of Yedi Kule, now called Heptapyrgion, which dominated the town. Names and date (1432) are written on a large inscription in Arabic over the entrance gate. It was long believed that the great hexagonal Yedi Kule citadel was a Byzantine work, to which Sungur Bey only added a new gate on which to write his name. Recent

93 See Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârîsinde*, 1, pp. 301–2 (with incomplete reading) and İbrahim Tatarlı, 'Turski kultovi sgradi i nadpisi v Bilgarija', *Godišnik na Sofijskija Univerzitet, Fakultet po Zapadni Filologiji* (Sofia, 1966), pp. 567–615, with complete text.

94 See Maximilian Braun, *Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarević von Konstantin dem Philosophen*, 's-Gravenhage (Wiesbaden, 1956), pp. 40–1. Compare also the account by Colin Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 68–9, who used another edition of the same text of Konstantin.

95 BOA, TT 26 from 1489/90, ff. 64–82.

96 We used the manuscript of the Vienna National Library, No. 1052 (Flügel, II, 259) where the work is called 'Tarih-i Edirne', f. 61v (ve Filibe'niñ Câmî-i 'Atîki ve mahrûse-i Brusa'da câmi-i şerîf). See also the modern Turkish edition of Abdurrahman Hibri, *Enisü'l-Müsâmirîn – Edirne Tarihi*, ed. Ratip Kazancıgil (Edirne, 1996), p. 67.

97 Barkan, 'Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin', p. 372.

and extensive dendrochronological work by Striker and Kuniholm, however, has proved that almost all the work is from 1431–2.

The same Sungur Çavuş Bey is also known to have been the founder of a number of important buildings of which nothing but notes in the sources and some old photographs have come down to us. Besides a monumental single-domed mosque in Edirne and another in Vidin on the Danube, he also built in 838/1434–5 in Bitola (Manastır), the second city of Slav Macedonia, a massive and ponderous Friday mosque (*cami*), a *zaviye*, a *han* to accommodate merchants and travellers, and a *hamam*. These buildings, situated on the former *tereke pazarı* (corn market) in the oldest part of the city, were the oldest known Ottoman monuments of this city and constituted the nucleus around which Ottoman Bitola developed. The cramped fortified Byzantino-Slavic town was situated on the hill overlooking the town in the north. This settlement was apparently destroyed during the conquest (1385) and afterwards slowly deserted in favour of the new site on the plain along the small river Dragor. During the construction of the mosque, stones from the ruins of old castles were reused, among them the famous Bitola inscription of the Bulgarian Tsar Ivan Vladislav from 1015. This surfaced again when in 1956 the mosque of Sungur Çavuş, known as Eski Cami, or Old Mosque, was demolished by order of the city council in order to 'beautify the town'. The *zaviye*, which also had the function of distributing food to the needy and poor, functioned until 1941.

The Eski Cami of Bitola appears in old photographs as a massive, block-like prayer hall surmounted by a dome with a circular drum, and preceded by a portico of three units resting on four heavy square pillars. Porch and prayer hall form one block which is, together with the circular drum of the dome, a very old feature in Ottoman architecture. The building is of interest because it is explicitly called a mosque in the preserved *vakıfname* from 838/April 1435. The domed and lead-covered building of Sungur Çavuş Bey in Edirne, which was only slightly smaller than the one in Bitola, however, is called a *mescid*. With the Bitola building the unknown architect clearly attempted to make the single-domed structure the architecturally dominant and focal point of the *külliye* (mosque complex). That is why the forms chosen were so heavy and impressive. The existing literature expresses the opinion that the Ottomans developed the T-plan mosque or *zaviye*-mosque because they wished to have a more monumental building as the focal point of their building complexes, the single-domed mosque not offering enough possibilities to attain this. The Bitola mosque was an example that pointed in a different direction. The building was, moreover, a very early example of the transition of the single-domed *mescids* of the past into a fully fledged Friday mosque, composed of a domed

square, a domed or vaulted porch and a tall minaret: the classical Ottoman building type, the most popular form of Ottoman mosque and, in the Balkans, often the sole representative of this art.⁹⁸

In 1436–7 Sultan Murad II completed the great stone bridge over the Vardar in Üsküp (Skopje), and a large congregational mosque on the site of the ruined monastery of St George on the Serava. Neither building has survived in its original form. The bridge was reconstructed in 987/1579. The mosque, a well-built rectangle with a flat wooden roof supported by two arcades of three columns each, burnt down twice: first by accident under Süleyman the Magnificent, to be reconstructed by him in 1539–40, and later, in 1689, on purpose, set fire to by the Habsburg army under General Piccolomini, who destroyed the entire town. It was rebuilt a second time under Ahmed III in 1124/1712. The story is related on large inscriptions, published by Elezović and Ayverdi.⁹⁹

Also dating from 839/1435–6 is the once large foundation of another member of the Mihaloğlu family, Firuz Bey, in the medieval Bulgarian capital of Tirnovo. It consisted of a relatively small, but very well-constructed domed *mescid*, as is stated on the foundation inscription, as well as an *imaret* in the sense of a public soup kitchen, a single *hamam*, a bridge over the Yantra river, a *han*, a *mescid* in the *han*, and a *medrese*, all in Tirnovo, and a *mescid* in the village of Murad Bey and another *mekteb* in Umur Bey. The complex was maintained from the tax revenue of the nearby villages of Umur Bey, Murad Bey, Pavlikeni, Mihaliç-i Buzurg and Mihaliç-i Küçük. The *imaret* and *han* disappeared long ago, the bridge was replaced by a concrete one and the mosque was demolished to discover the ruins of the palace of the Bulgarian medieval kings underneath it, destroyed during the violent capture of 1393. Only the *hamam*, the oldest in Bulgaria, is still standing as a ruin. During the above-mentioned excavations a brick was found in the ruined walls of the mosque, in the clay of which an inscription had been carved, when it was still wet. The inscription states: 'Kosta, son of Yanako, on the 27 of the month of June, these karamidi [bricks] were made and built in the masgit of Ferizbeg'. The Tirnovo brick is a good

98 For the *vakıfname* see Hasan Kaleši, 'Najstarija vakufnama u Jugoslaviji', *Prilozi za Orientalnu Filologiju* 10–11 (1961), 55–74, with photograph of the mosque and transcription and facsimile of the text. For the mosque see also Krum Tomovski, 'Djamii vo Bitola', *Godišen Zbornik na Tehničkiot Fakultet Skopje* 2, 2 (1957), 29–60. For a photograph and short description of the Edirne mosque of Çavuş Bey see Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 381–2. For the Bitola inscription see Jordan Zaimov, *Bitolski Nadpis na Ivan Vladislav Samodirec Bălgarski* (Sofia, 1970), p. 160.

99 Gliša Elezović, 'Turski Spomenici u Skoplju, III, Zadužbine sultana Murata II', *Glasnik Skopskog Naučnog Društva* 3–4 ([Skopje] 1928), 177–92; Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 564–9. See also the magnificent work of Lidija Kumbaraci-Bogojević, *Osmanlijski Spomenici vo Skopje* (Skopje, 1998), pp. 16–26.

illustration of Ottoman building practices: plan, artistic style and concept were provided by the Ottomans, the materials by a local workforce who can be presumed to have participated also in the manual labour.¹⁰⁰

Under Murad II (1421–51) a number of important buildings were erected in Edirne, which was developed during his rule into the real capital of the empire. The most important is the huge new imperial mosque, known as Üç Şerefeli Cami, the largest Ottoman mosque hitherto built and in many ways an innovative building which was to become the starting point for the great developments in architecture in the sixteenth century. Murad himself, and his commanders, also erected a number of other important structures. Still standing are half a dozen small, but monumental and very well constructed, domed *mescids* – the Şahmelek, Kuşcu Doğan, Kirazlı, Gazi Hoca and Hızır Ağa mosques and the Saruca Paşa *mescid* – most of them with an inner space of seven or eight metres diameter, covered by a dome on a belt of Turkish triangles. Among the more important works of this time is the so-called Beylerbey Camii in the northern part of the city, above the road to Murad's Yeni Saray (New Palace), on the banks of the Meriç river. Its founder was Sinanuddin Yusuf Paşa, generally called Sinan Paşa, who was *beylerbey* of Rumeli under Murad, but who had before served as governor of Thessaly, where the early Ottoman chroniclers (Aşıkpaşazade, Oruç, Ruhi-i Edirnevi, Neşri) mentioned him in connection with the struggle between the princes Musa and Mehmed in 1413 and later as *beylerbey* of Rumeli. The building has no inscription. The date of construction is given by the early seventeenth-century historian of Edirne, Hibri Efendi, who noted: 'Another [building] is the Beylerbey Camii, which is roofed by a dome and a half dome. But which *beylerbey* has made it is not known. However, its *vakfiye* is dated in the year 832 [1428–9]. His [the founder's] name is given as Yusuf Paşa.'¹⁰¹

In a survey of the foundation's income and expenditure contained in the *vakıf defter* from 1568–9 the main building is explicitly called an *imaret*.¹⁰² A *medrese* with ten student cells, a *mescid*, a huge double *hamam* and the *türbe* of the founder belonged furthermore to this great foundation. The *türbe* and

100 For the Tirnovo brick see the periodical *Arheologija* 2 (Sofia, 1967), 27–35, and the comments of M. Kiel in *Studies*, pp. xiii–xiv. The accounts of the *vakıf* of Firuz Bey and list of the staff of his foundation were published in *Turski Izvori za Bălgarskata Istorija*, vol. III (Sofia, 1972), pp. 430–7. For the inscription on the mosque of Firuz Bey see Ananiasz Zajaczkowski, 'Materiały do epigrafiki osmanskotureckiej z Bułgarii', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 26, 2 (1963), 12–15, with a good photograph.

101 Codex Vindob. 1052, f. 23r.

102 BOA, TT 1070, from AH 975/AD 1568–9, partly published by Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı*, pp. 253–5.

the *hamam* still stand (as of 2006), both in an incredible state of ruin and decay. The main building, now a mosque, was wrecked by an earthquake and drastically restored and partly reconstructed in the 1970s. The main building of the group shows an interesting variant of the T-plan type. A central, domed room is flanked by two smaller domed rooms, accessible only through doors leading from the main hall. The latter has a separate section for prayer, reached by several steps and covered by a stilted dome. Its most specific feature is the *mihrab* wall in the form of an apse, covered by a melon-shaped half-dome. This is perhaps the first example of the application of the half-dome in Ottoman architecture, an element which was to have a great future. It was soon to be followed in the *zaviye*-mosque of Yahşi Bey in Tire in 1441¹⁰³ and very probably also played a role in conceiving the plan of the great mosque of Mehmed Fatih in Istanbul (1462). The five-unit porch in front of the Edirne building is a modern reconstruction. The ruined *türbe* still shows some panels with a cobalt blue tile decoration, a relic of the Seljuk past and rare in the Balkans.¹⁰⁴

Less than a decade later, but also without a date secured by a *Bauinschrift*, is the highly monumental Muradiye Cami in the eastern outskirts of Edirne. It shows roughly the same plan as the Beylerbey Camii but is one-third bigger. A central domed section of 9.80 metres in diameter is followed by a slightly smaller prayer section, surmounted by a dome. This two-domed space is flanked by a domed room on each side. This is now connected with the main space through large arches but they have evidently been broken through later, when the space was united with the main room. The building is preceded by a monumental porch of five units. The glory of this building is the tile decoration of the walls of the prayer section and the *mihrab*, showing evidently Chinese-inspired flower motives in various shades of blue against a white background.

Mecdi, the sixteenth-century translator of Taşköprüzade's famous biography of Ottoman scholars *Şaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya*, claims to have seen the *vakfiye* of the building dated 830/1426–7.¹⁰⁵ Hibri, however, gives 839/1435–6 as the date of construction and adds a number of interesting details in his description:

Another [building] is the Muradiye Mosque, built by His Highness the Father of Munificence [Murad II], which has two domes and one minaret, the minaret being decorated with tiles. It is built on a high hill. He himself had made it Mevlevihane [a lodge for Mevlevi dervishes] and indeed, to ensure that during

103 Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârîsinde*, II, p. 542.

104 The most detailed description of the buildings of Beylerbey Yusuf Paşa, and the best plan and elevation is by Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârîsinde*, II, pp. 377–81.

105 Mehmed Mecdi Efendi, *Haddâîku's Şekâik* (Istanbul 1268 [1852]), vol. I, ed. Abülkadir Özcan (Istanbul, 1989), p. 217.

the ritual dance (*sema*) sorbets would flow, pipes have been placed [in the walls], and some of them are still there. After some time, when it became a noble mosque, a separate Mevlevihane was built opposite it.

The meals prepared in royal *imaret*, being extremely tasty and abundant, are not only given to the Mevlevi dervishes and the poor students but also to the houses in the surroundings. This mosque was built in the year 839 [1435–6]. It is related that when His Highness Sultan Murad Han beheld this place, he immediately ordered the construction of this priceless Mevlevihane for His Exaltedness Mevlana [Celaledin Rumi].¹⁰⁶

The building, one of the best representatives of the so-called Bursa plan mosque, or *zaviye*-mosque, was thus definitely not intended to be a mosque. It only became one much later, by removing the walls separating the main central hall from the lateral rooms, which can hardly have been anything else but guest rooms or rooms for the Mevlevi dervishes. As with the Orta İmaret of Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, or the Yıldırım Camii nearby, the actual cooking must have been done in a separate building, which has not survived. It should be added that the accounts of income and expenditure from 1491, mentioned before, call the building either an *imaret* or *Mevlevihane*. The well-preserved *Bauinschrift* has only *imaret*.

In the year the Muradiye was completed, Murad II started the construction of the grandest mosque of the empire hitherto, the Yeni Cami (New Mosque) as it was called. It is known to us as the Üç Şerefeli Cami because of its largest minaret, which has three successive balconies, a novelty in Ottoman architecture. The date of construction is handed down by the early Ottoman chroniclers and is written on various well-preserved inscriptions. The great building (62 by 64 metres) was begun in 841/1437–8 and was completed in 851/1447. As its site, a flat terrain was chosen outside the old walled city of Edirne in the market area, a little north of the Eski Cami (Old Mosque). The plan evidently is a further development of the Ulu Cami of Manisa, as was first pointed out by Robert Anhegger and is now generally accepted. Manisa had been the capital of the beylik of Saruhan in western Anatolia, the place where Murad had resided as prince before coming to the throne, and the place where he spent a year and a half in retirement after his abdication in favour of his young son Mehmed II (1445–6). The great colonnaded courtyard, the first in Ottoman architecture, came from Manisa, as did the concept of an oblong prayer hall, covered by a huge central dome and several smaller ones over the lateral spaces. The more remote ancestor is the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, and

106 Codex Vindob. 1052, ff. 16v–17r.

the beyliks of western Anatolia had had intensive cultural contact with Syria, to prove, in a sense, their independence from the successors of the Seljuks in central Anatolia. The general form of the Edirne building, however, was wholly 'Ottomanised', made more homogeneous and surveyable. The main dome, spanning 26 metres, is the largest the Ottomans had constructed up to that point. It rests on a hexagonal base of arches, supported by the front and rear walls and by two massive hexagonal piers. The proportions of the buildings are still low and ponderous, the architect evidently being unsure about pushing the enormous dome to a greater height. The Üç Şerefeli Cami is a revolutionary building. Its role in the development of Ottoman architecture was once compared by Sir Nicolas Pevsner with that of the choir of the Abbey of St Denis as reconstructed under Abbot Suger for the emergence of Gothic architecture. It paved the way for the development of the vast centralised inner spaces of the sixteenth century, but it nevertheless shows an almost Romanesque bulkiness. As a building it was the greatest architectural undertaking in the Balkans since the days of Justinian.

The local historian and contemporary Ruhi-i Edirnevi is the only one of the early Ottoman chroniclers to give the name of the architect: Usta Müsliheddin. The same source tells us that Müsliheddin had also constructed the great bridge of Cisir-i Ergene (now Uzunköprü), south of Edirne, which was completed in 847/1443–4, and was also employed by Murad's successor, Mehmed II, for his new palace on the banks of the Tunca river outside Edirne.¹⁰⁷ Parallel to the construction of the Üç Şerefeli Cami, work was undertaken on buildings designed partly to promote the hygiene of the Edirne Muslims, partly to provide revenue for the upkeep of Murad's great foundations. One is the Alaca Hamam, a large *hamam* with an exquisite stalactite decoration, built just north of the northern wall of Byzantine Adrianopolis, and the other, on an even more magnificent scale, on the main north–south artery of Edirne, to the east of the old castle walls: the so-called Tahtakale Hamamı in the Saraçlar Caddesi. The Alaca Hamam is dated by an inscription, now housed in the Edirne Museum.¹⁰⁸ The Tahtakale Hamamı is one of the largest and most important works of this kind in the entire domain of Ottoman architecture. In

107 For the text of Ruhi see Victor L. Ménage, 'Edirne'li Rûhî'ye Atfedilen Osmanlı Tarihi', in *Ord. Prof. İsmail Uzunçarşılı'ya Armağan* (Ankara, 1976), pp. 328–39. For the historian himself see J. H. Mordtmann, 'Rûhî Edirnewî', *Mitteilungen zur osmanische Geschichte* 2 (1923–4), 129–36; and Hedda Reindl, *Männer um Bayezid* (Berlin, 1983), pp. 7–15. For the link between Manisa and Edirne see Robert Anhegger, 'Beiträge zur osmanischen Baugeschichte II, 1, Die Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne und die Ulu Cami in Manisa', *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 8 (1958), 40–5.

108 Dijkema, *Inscriptions*, pp. 25–6. Edirne Museum: 841 (1440/1).

contrast to the Beylerbey Hamamı and the Gazi Mihal Hamamı, mentioned above, which are only slightly older, this *hamam* has large, domed, disrobing rooms, and departs from the Syrian plan of the aforementioned *hamams*. The male disrobing room is surmounted by a huge dome of almost 16 metres in diameter, which sits on an elaborate stalactite filling in each of the four corners. Through a tepidarium of six compartments one enters the bath room proper, which shows the classical four-*eyvan* scheme, with four domed cells in the remaining corners. All vaulting is highly elaborate, showing a profusion of muqarnas (stalactite vaults), fillings and geometrically designed vaults. In the tepidarium we even see a melon-shaped half-dome, the same elements as applied in the Beylerbey Camii from a decade earlier.

In contrast to the male section, the section of the great Edirne *hamam* reserved for women is but modest. Here the dome of the disrobing room, 9.70 metres in diameter, sits on Turkish triangles. The tepidarium is very small and the bath room proper shows a reduced version of the four-*eyvan* scheme, with two *eyvans* only and with only two cells, flanking each other, without *eyvan* between them. The great bath, which without exaggeration might be called a 'cathedral of hygiene', is not dated by inscription but must be placed around 1435–40, when Murad was actively promoting Edirne into a truly Islamic capital. The *hamam* occupies an area of 58 by 28 metres. According to the annual accounts of 896/1491 published by Barkan it was the largest source of income for the *dariülhadis* (religious school) of Murad II in Edirne.¹⁰⁹ Another building in this series is the exquisite *hamam* built in the depression between the Muradiye Cami of Edirne and the famous Selimiye and popularly known as Yeniçeri Hamamı. Compared with those mentioned above it is small. Its importance lies in the high-quality decoration of the vaults and dome, with spiral, star and half-melon domes, sitting on elaborate muqarnas work in cut plaster. This single *hamam* served as a source of revenue for the *küllîye* (mosque complex) of Murad II in Cisir-i Ergene (Uzunköprü), as is mentioned in the annual accounts of 896/1491.¹¹⁰

109 For a detailed plan of the *hamam* see Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, p. 472, which, however, omits the double water container and the heating room. A different plan is given by Sabih Erken, 'Edirne Hamamları', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 10 (1973), 403–19, plan 3. See also İlter Büyükdıgan, 'Tahtakale Hamam, Edirne, Turkey', in *Secular Medieval Architecture in the Balkans 1300–1500 and its Preservation*, ed. Sl. Curčić and E. Hadjistryphonos (Thessalonike, 1997), pp. 330–1. For the 1491 accounts see Barkan, 'Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin', p. 314.

110 Barkan, 'Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin', no. 7, p. 326. For an excellent plan, photographs and detailed drawings of the vaults (but no identification of the founder) see Doğan Kuban, 'İkinci Murat Çağı Hamamları Mukarnas Bezemeleri Üzerine Notlar', in *Ord. Prof. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı'ya Armağan* (Ankara, 1988), p. 455, appendix.

In the 1430s important work was also carried out under Murad II in the larger provincial centres, such as Üsküp (Skopje) and Filibe (Plovdiv). The bridge and Great Mosque of the sultan himself have already been mentioned. Üsküp was situated in a dominant location at the intersection of six important roads from all corners of the Balkans. It was therefore chosen as the base for the operation against Serbia and Albania, which had not yet been entirely subdued. Üsküp had been taken in 1392, during the aftermath of the battle of Kosovo, by the provincial commander Paşa Yiğit. Paşa Yiğit was in charge of the western *uc* throughout Yıldırım Bayezid's reign (1389–1402) and subsequently under Emir Süleyman, Musa and Mehmed I, and is mentioned as such in the early Ottoman chronicles. He was succeeded by his son, or adopted son, İshak, who is the founder of the noble family of Ishaković, which dominated the town for almost a century, before being replaced by governors of *devşirme* origin.

In 842/1438–9, İshak Bey completed an extensive *küllîye* in Üsküp, of which the most important parts still survive today. They are situated outside the narrow boundaries of the old Byzantino-Serbian capital, half a mile to the north of it, on the road to the plain of Kosovo and further north to Bosnia. Originally the foundation of İshak Bey consisted of a *zaviye*-mosque, a *medrese*, a *türbe*, a kitchen building and a *hamam*, grouped together, and a second group consisting of a six-domed *bedestan* with a large *han* opposite. Both the latter buildings constituted the core of the Üsküp Çarşı district. Of the first mentioned group, the *medrese*, the kitchen building and the *hamam*, all three of which are mentioned in the foundation charter, have disappeared. The *hamam* was still standing in 1925 when Gliša Elezović published the first detailed study about the Ottoman monuments of Skopje. The main building, known as Alaca İmaret, and the *türbe* are still standing. The main building is dated by its original *Bauinschrift* to 842/1438–9 and is called a 'noble *imaret*'.

In 1519 the *imaret* was changed considerably by removing the lateral walls which separated the central hall from the side rooms. This change can still be seen by the trained eye. The new arches, made to support the superstructure, are crooked and awkward improvisations. The transformation from *imaret* into mosque proper is documented by an inscription from 1519 placed above a door in the left flank, made from an old window. It states that the old building was 'enlarged' into a 'great mosque' (*cami-i kebir*) on order of Hasan Bey, a grandson of the founder in the month of Receb of 925/July 1519. It is one of the rare documents pinning down the date of the transformation of an original, and early, *zaviye*-mosque.

The *han* and the *bedestan* of İshak Bey are undated but must be from the same years as the *imaret*. Both are mentioned in the *vakfiye*, which is dated

Zilkade 848/February 1445. The *han*, locally known as Suli An (Sulu Han), is the oldest of its kind in the Balkans to have come down to us largely intact. It shows the usual rectangular cloistered courtyard with two stories of barrel-vaulted cells. Those on the upper floor disappeared in earthquakes and fires and were reconstructed in their nineteenth-century form. The lower part is largely authentic. The court is flanked on its short side by a vast hall with flat crossvaults on four massive square pillars. It functioned as the stables for the animals in winter time. Along the façade on the main shopping street of the *çarşı* (market) was a row of twenty shops fixed to the *han* proper. They have now completely lost their original shape and were not reconstructed as they had been.

On the opposite side of the main shopping street stood İshak Bey's covered market hall, the *bedestan*, which had, according to the *vakfiye*, twenty-four shops on its four sides. The main hall must have been covered by six domes on two heavy square pillars but they have been destroyed long ago. Inside the still-standing four walls, new wooden shops were built during a renovation in 1906.¹¹¹

In the fateful year of 1444, when a huge crusader army was laying waste Danubian Bulgaria and advancing on Varna on the Black Sea, the *beylerbey* of Rumeli, Şihabuddin Paşa, also known as Kula Şahin Paşa, was completing a vast *küllîye* in his residence, Filibe (Plovdiv). The complex was loosely spaced out over an area of more than a hectare at the southern end of the Meriç bridge of his fourteenth-century predecessor Lala Şahin Paşa, straddling the main axis of the Ottoman city. This ran from the Cumaya Cami of Murad II at the foot of the ruins of the Byzantino-Bulgarian hilltop town in the south, to the bridgehead in the north. The new compound and the mosque of Sultan Murad were the two foci around which Ottoman Filibe would develop. The complex consisted of a *zaviye*-mosque, a large *han* at the bridgehead, a large and very monumental *hamam* across the road, the mausoleum of the founder, a kitchen block, a *mektep* (school) and, between the *zaviye*-mosque and the river, a large, U-shaped *medrese* with twelve student cells. The building inscription gives 848/1444 as the year of its completion. Five of the seven buildings of this group survived into the early twentieth century. They are indicated on the detailed 1891 map of Plovdiv by J. H. Schnitter. The *hamam*, which was so big

¹¹¹ Fundamental for this group of buildings are Gliša Elezović, 'Turski Spomenici u Skoplju', *Glasnik Skopskog Naučnog Društva* 1 (1925), 136–76 for the buildings, and *Turski Spomenici*, vol. I (Belgrade, 1952), for the *vakfiye*. See also Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârîsinde*, II, pp. 557–63 with good plans and photographs and transcription of the inscriptions. The statement that the *han* no longer exists is based on insufficient observation.

that it could house the local parliament of eastern Rumeli, was demolished in 1931. The *medrese* is known from some good photographs preserved in the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul, which also has photographs of the *hamam* before, and in the course of, being demolished. Today only the *zaviye*-mosque and the mausoleum of the founder are preserved, both restored by the Bulgarian Institute for Monuments of Culture and in an excellent state.

The socio-economic and religious-educative compound was financed from the tax revenue of a vast property, including many houses and shops in Edirne and Malkara, five Turkish villages near Malkara and the very large and rich villages of Kuklen, Vodno, Mavrovo and Novo Selo, south of Filibe itself, as well as two big rice plantations of which the irrigation canals had been dug on the initiative of the founder. In 1528 this property near Filibe yielded on its own, according to the *vakıf* section of the *tahrir* register, a total of 179,897 *akçe*.¹¹² The villages mentioned above were highly privileged. Kuklen and Vodno also contained Orthodox Christian monasteries which, especially in later centuries, developed into important centres of Bulgarian Christian culture.¹¹³ The so-called Imaret Camii of Filibe is one of the largest of its kind in the Balkans outside Edirne. It is composed of eleven domed or vaulted units. The heart of the building is a central, dome space of almost nine metres in diameter, lit by an oculus in the centre of the dome, covered by a turret. This central hall is flanked by two domed rooms of six metres in diameter each. The *mihrab* is placed in a domed room in the rear, which opens towards the main hall. Most of the domes rest on intricate belts of Turkish triangles and pendentive-like fillings of very rich muqarnas cut in plaster on a background of geometric brickwork. Curious, and for long not understood, are two barrel-vaulted corridors between the lateral rooms and the monumental portico, which runs in front of the building. They have, apparently, no function at

¹¹² BOA, TT 370, f. 101.

¹¹³ For short descriptions and good photographs of these, and other monasteries in the country see Georgi Čavrákov and Konstantin Tančev, *Bălgarski Manastiri* (Sofia, 1978), pp. 331–41. The story about the destruction of the monastery in the course of the forced mass conversion of the Christians of the Rhodope district in the 1660s given in this work is part of the nineteenth-century Bulgarian nationalist mythology. The story was widely disseminated during the communist period. The Ottoman *tahrir defters* from 1516, 1529, 1569, 1595 and 1712 clearly show that Islamisation did take place but was a process stretching over more than two centuries. After the fall of communism the monastery of Gorno Vodno was transformed into a luxury brothel. For details on the real story of the conversion of the Rhodopes see M. Kiel, 'Istorijata na "nasilstveno masovo pomjuszulmančvane" na Rodopskite Hristijani i njakoi izvori, svırzani s nego. Osmanskite registri na naselieto i danáčното obligane ot XVI–XVII v.: Krajat na Mitologijata?', in *Mjuszulmanskata Kultura po Bălgarskite Zemi*, ed. Rositsa Gradeva and Svetlana Ivanova (Sofia, 1998), pp. 56–126 (with facsimiles of the most important Ottoman sources).

all. The portico consists of five domed and vaulted units resting on six massive masonry piers. The minaret, which can be reached through the narrow lateral corridor on the right, has a shaft in the form of a twisted spiral. The entire building is made of carefully executed cloisonné. The fronton above the central unit of the portico has a ceramo-plastique decoration of geometric brickwork.

In the *Bauinschrift* the building is called *al-‘imaret al-‘aliye*. The chronicler Neşri, who also mentions the construction, likewise calls it an *imaret*.¹¹⁴ Locally the building is called İmaret Camii. In the 1960s and 1970s the building was carefully restored by the able architect Nikola Mushanov. When taking off the various coats of plaster on the inside of the building it was discovered that the two lateral rooms, which nowadays form the cross axis of the building, were originally closed off from the main central hall by solid walls. These had been removed at a much later stage, as the various coats of plaster indicated. It was also found that underneath the floor there was a much older, original floor, covered with marble and having a water pond in the middle. Thus the central room of the ‘mosque’ had originally been something else. The prayer section proper had been restricted solely to the second dome section, which was originally reached by five steps in the middle. Niches to put one’s shoes in before mounting to the prayer section were also found, as were chimneys in the lateral rooms. The function of the curious lateral corridors then became clear. The right one partly gave access to the minaret, and to the lateral room, which had been nothing other than a guest room of the institution. The corridor to the left had in fact been a separate, lateral entrance to the guest room, where one could enter without disturbing those assembled around the pond in the central hall. As had been the case with the Alaca İmaret of İshak Bey in Üsküp the space for praying had been enlarged at the expense of the function of accommodating travelling dervishes and scholars and other distinguished guests. The change occurred in the third decade of the sixteenth century, when Sunni orthodoxy became dominant and early Ottoman institutions and brotherhoods like the *ahi*, who made offering hospitality to travellers their main task, slowly disappeared or fused with other organisations.

It would be better to cease referring to the kind of building to which the İmaret Camii of Plovdiv, as well as the Alaca İmaret in Üsküp, the Mihaloğlu

¹¹⁴ ‘Kula Şahin Filibe’de bir imaret ve bir medrese yapıldı’: Neşri, *Gihannüma die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlana Mehmed Neschrî*, vol. I: *Einleitung und Text des Cod. Menzel*, ed. Fr. Taeschner (Leipzig, 1951), p. 230.

İmareti and the Muradiye in Edirne, or the Gazi Evrenos İmareti in Gümülcine, belong as *zaviye*-mosques. They were not a combination of various functions, not a *zaviye* to which a mosque had been attached in order to create a more monumental building at the centre of a *külliye*. The greater part of these buildings were simply *zaviyes* for the *ahi* brotherhood and were transformed into mosques at a much later stage. Not for nothing is the head of the institution called *Ahi* in the foundation charters and notes in the *vakıf* registers, such as those for Gümülcine and in 1470 for the İsa Bey İmareti in Üsküp.¹¹⁵ Only in a limited number of buildings of the same plan was this type used to accommodate the Mevlevi brotherhood, as was explicitly the case in Edirne's Muradiye, and also in the case of the Yeşil İmareti Camii/Yahşi Bey Camii in the west Anatolian city of Tire, from 1441, where the *vakfiye* calls it a *zaviye* and the traveller Evliya Çelebi mentions that it had previously been a *mevlevihane*.

The important archaeological findings in the İmareti Camii in Plovdiv have been left visible during the restoration of the building which, after the collapse of communism, again serves as a house of prayer.

The *türbe* of the founder of this building complex, singularly important for Filibe, stands in the greatest contrast to the monumentality of the other buildings. It is but a simple, brick-built domed and lead-covered octagon of modest dimensions, situated to the right of the main building. It doubtlessly expresses the intentions of this old warlord, who played a decisive role in the fateful battle of Varna, and again during the conquest of Constantinople, to have his last resting place as simple as possible, as had also been the wish of his master of many years, Murad II. The mausoleum was also restored and is still held in veneration by the local Plovdiv Muslims.¹¹⁶

A grand building completed in the same year as the *imareti* of Plovdiv is the so-called Bey Hamamı on the main central square of Thessalonike (Ottoman Selanik). Murad II had taken the city in 1430 and had converted the early Christian basilica of Achairopoietos into a mosque, later known as Eski Cami. In the early 1440s he started the construction of a huge double *hamam* in the

115 The key to the vast literature on the *ahi* brotherhood is Ziya Kazıcı, 'Ahilik', *TDVİA* 2 pp. 540–3. See also 'Akhi' in *El2*, 1, pp. 321–3 (Taeschner); Çağatay, *Bir Türk Kurumu olan Ahilik*; Franz Taeschner, 'Die bürgerliche Futuwwa. Das Achiitum im seldchukischen und nachseldchukischen Anatolien', in Franz Taeschner, *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam* (München, 1979), pp. 277–402; Mikail Bayram, *Ahi Evren ve Ahi Teşkilatının Kuruluşu* (Konya, 1991).

116 For an early description see Gertruda Rudlov-Hille and Otto Rudlov, 'Grad Plovdiv i negovite sgradi', *Izvestija na Bălgarskija Arheologičeski Institut* 8 (1934), 379–425, which also includes the Schnitter plan of 1891. For more detail see Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 479–85. For the important inscription see in detail Tatarlı, 'Turski kultovi sgradi i nadpisi v Bilgarija', p. 593.

centre of town, about the largest of all Turkish *hamams* in the Balkans and exquisitely decorated with a profusion of stalactites. Remarkable is the large (15 metres in diameter) octagonal, domed disrobing room of the male section. It is followed by a likewise octagonal tepidarium. The hot section proper shows the fully developed four-*eyvan* plan, with four separate cells (*halvets*), one at each corner. The first one on the left side is covered by a muqarnas-dome with a profusion of stalactites. It must have been the room reserved for the sultan himself, as is hinted at by Evliya Çelebi in 1668.¹¹⁷ The female half of the bath is more modest. It has a square disrobing room, followed by an octagonal tepidarium. The hot section, *sıcaklık*, is a tripartite rectangular vaulted space communicating with two *halvets* of the same size as in the male half of the bath.

A long inscription in Arabic, placed over the main entrance portal, mentions Sultan Murad, son of Mehmed, son of Bayezid Han and his full title as Leader of the Muslims, and ‘sultan al-guzat wa-’l-mudjahidin’ as builder, and the month of Cemazıyelevvel of the year 848/September–October 1444 as the date of completion. In the 1970s the great monument was bought by the Greek Archaeological Service and has since been restored in a most exemplary manner, now serving as an exhibition room.

A little north of it stood, until the end of the 1920s, a large and monumental *han* that also belonged to the foundations of Sultan Murad in this city. A long Arabic inscription gave the name of the ruler. In the nineteenth century, when the story of Ottoman architecture was unknown, the building was declared to be a Byzantine work. It was a vast rectangle around a cloistered courtyard with seven arches at the long sides and five at the short sides. On the ground floor it had thirty-three vaulted cells for the accommodation of travellers and on the first floor a corresponding number. At the rear, opposite the entrance, was a vast vaulted stable with twelve massive square piers carrying the vaults of the two-bay hall. This is the same solution as at the almost contemporary Sulu Han in Üsküp, albeit much bigger. On three sides of the exterior the Bey Han had vaulted shops, nine on both short sides and eleven at the long front side. The great *hamam* was also called Bey Hamamı, *bey* being the colloquial title of the ruler in the period the buildings came into being. Both buildings served as a source of revenue for the upkeep of Murad’s church/mosque in Thessalonike. The quality and especially the grand size of both works show the scale of investment to reconstruct Selanik as an Ottoman

117 ‘Ve padişahlar girüb «gusl edecek bir kasr-i ‘alisi var . . .’: Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahat-namesi*, VIII, p. 160.

town.¹¹⁸ To the extensive foundations of İshak Bey in Üsküp, Şihabuddin Paşa in Filibe and Sultan Murad in Edirne and Selanik, all created in the 1430s and early 1440s, should be added four mosques and *mescids*, three *zaviyes*, two caravansarys, a *hamam* and two bridges, all of Gazi Turhan Bey, in various places in Thessaly, but none now extant (the *vakfiye* of these foundations was written in 1446), as well as the monumental domed *mescid* of Şarabdar Hasan Bey in the castle of Vize from 1444 and the Yeşilce Cami, also known as İmaret of Mezid Bey, in Edirne, which was finished two years earlier.¹¹⁹

This whole group of buildings marks the summit of a highly creative period, in which Ottoman architecture definitively found its own code of aesthetics. The year 1444 ended with the 'Varna crisis' when the huge crusader army under King Wladislaw Jagiello and the redoubtable Janoš Hunyadi put the whole of Ottoman northern Bulgaria to the torch before being finally annihilated. Another crisis took place in 1448 when the second battle of Kosovo finally removed the threat of invasion from the west. These years were not very productive for architecture. Only shortly before his death (1451) did Sultan Murad again show confidence in the future by starting a new palace on the banks of the Meriç river outside Edirne. It was to be finished by his son and successor, Mehmed II, with whom a new period begins.

The Ottoman architecture of the Balkans around 1450 shows that by then the land had been wholly integrated into Ottoman culture. The plans for the buildings and their whole conception came from north-western Anatolia as an imported art, but the masonry often shows local influences.¹²⁰ The vast

118 For a plan and elevation of the building which has now disappeared see L. de Beylié, *L'habitation byzantine* (Grenoble and Paris, 1902), p. 71. In later local literature the opinion that the great and specifically Ottoman work was of Byzantine origin was repeated until recently. See also the excellent new study by Paschalis Androudis, 'Historical and Archaeological Evidence on the Great Karavan-Saray (Büyük Kervansarayı) of Thessaloniki', *Makedonika* 35 (2005–6), 63–97. For the Bey Hamamı see M. Kiel, 'Notes on Some Turkish monuments in Thessaloniki', *Balkan Studies* 11 (1970), pp. 123–48, reprinted and updated in Kiel, *Studies*. Good photographs and plans can also be found in Anna Zombou-Asimi, 'Bey Hamam, Thessaloniki, Greece', in *Secular Architecture in the Balkans*, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjistryphonos (Thessalonike, 1997), pp. 318–21. Anna Zombou was the leader of the restoration of the great *hamam*. See also Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 536–7 (with the incorrect reading of the date as 840, failing to recognise the *şamân* (8) before the *arba'in*).

119 Both the two latter buildings have long been in an incredible state of decay. The *zaviye*-mosque of Mezid Bey was recently drastically 'restored', losing most of its original features. For this building see Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde*, II, pp. 397–400, and Kuran, *Mosque*, pp. 126–8. For its *vakıf* property see Gökbilgin, *Paşa Livâsı*, pp. 243–4.

120 For local influences see Robert Ousterhout, 'Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture', *Muqarnas* 12 (1995), 48–62. See also the excellent overview of Slobodan Ćurčić, 'Architecture in the Age of Insecurity', in Ćurčić and Hadjistryphonos (eds.), *Secular Architecture in the Balkans*, pp. 19–51.

expanses of the Balkans were a new land for Islam, where all the institutions it needed had to be imported since they did not exist in the local architectural repertoire (mosques, *medreses*, *hans*, *hamams*, *zaviyes*, *türbes* and so on). It might be suggested that this factor greatly helped to push the development of Ottoman architecture forward and gave it more space for experimenting than in the more traditional Anatolia. By 1450 the south-eastern Balkans had become fully integrated in Ottoman culture, becoming a part of the Turkish world. The census and taxation registers of the early period make this clear for the ethnic and religious situation. The preserved monuments of Ottoman architecture make the intensity of this integration visible to us still today.

Ottoman warfare, 1300–1453

PÁL FODOR

The formative period, c.1300–1370s

The early Ottoman military organisation was a peculiar amalgam of Turkoman nomadic, Seljuk-Ilkhanid and Byzantine elements, but it was the nomadic tradition which predominated among the various constituent parts in the early period of the formation of the state. As in other Eurasian nomadic societies, it may well have been very difficult to distinguish between society and military among the Turkomans living in the Bithynian marches. All followers of the Ottomans capable of fighting could and did participate in raiding or in defence if need arose. The predatory raids were called *akın* in Turkish, and those taking part in them were *akıncı* (later, as the Islamic character of the state strengthened, the term *gazi*, that is, warrior of the faith, came to be preferred).¹ Yet, apart from the undifferentiated bands of warriors, we see from the outset a relatively small but well-organised and well-trained force which gathered around the ruler and rendered services to him in war and peace.

This type of 'military retinue' was not an Ottoman invention. It was a universal institution which had existed in the east and the west since time immemorial. In the empires of the Inner Asian Turks and Uighurs the retinue of the *kagan* (ruler) was called *buyruk*, while the Karahanids and the Mongols knew it under the names *koldaş* and *nökör*, respectively.² The same body

¹ Muharrem Ergin, *Dede Korkut Kitabı*, vol. I: *Giriş – Metin – Faksimile*; vol. II: *İndeks*, Gramer (Ankara, 1958–63), II, p. 8; Ahmedi, 'Ahmedi's History of the Ottoman Dynasty', tr. Kemal Silay, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 (1992), 137, 147; cf. Pál Fodor, 'Ahmedi's Dāsitān as a Source of Early Ottoman History', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 38, 1–2 (1984), 52–3; Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks* by Doukas, ed. and tr. Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1975), pp. 133–4. According to Ruhi (Halil Erdoğan Cengiz and Yaşar Yücel, 'Rûhî Târîhi', *Belgeler* 14, 18 (1989–92), 376), Ertuğrul was appointed *akıncı başı* by Sultan Alaeddin.

² György Györffy, 'Die Rolle des *buyruk* in der alttürkischen Gesellschaft', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 11 (1960), 169–79; Mario Grignaschi, 'Les guerriers

of warriors appeared among various western and eastern European 'barbarian' peoples, many of whom had founded their own states by the end of the first millennium (Celtic *vassus*, German *Trost* or *Gesinde*, Russian *družina* and Scandinavian *hird*, for example).³ The military retinue was a group of armed, mainly free men (the majority of them foreigners), who served on a voluntary basis and were attached personally to the leader. They were his closest companions, friends and servants; they commanded the troops in wars, while a select group of them served as his bodyguard. Their livelihood was secured by their master, predominantly from the booty acquired during incursions and wars. The strength of these retinues ranged from a few dozen to 3,000 men. When the founders of the new states began to transform their personal might into territorial power, they relied heavily on their military retinues, delegating them to and settling them on the territories they controlled. In this *Gefolgschaft*-type of state, it is the military retinue to which the origins of the formal institutions of power can be traced back.

The counterpart of this institution among the Oğuz/Turkomans, the predecessors of the Ottomans, was known as *yoldaş* and *yiğit*.⁴ In addition, the chiefs and their most renowned companions willingly assumed the title *alp* or *alperen* (hero, brave man), an epithet of the distinguished nomadic adventurers-warriors from the time of the ancient Turks.⁵ With the ascendancy of the Chinggisid states, there was a clear tendency to replace the term *yoldaş* by the word *nökör/nöker*, its Mongolian equivalent. In view of this we can regard it as

domestiques dans la féodalité turque', in VI. *Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara 20–26 Ekim 1961. Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler* (Ankara, 1967), pp. 210–11; B. Y. Vladimirtsov, *Moğolların İçtimai Teşkilâtı. Moğol Göçebe Feodalizmi*, trans. Abdülkadir İnan (Ankara, 1944), pp. 133–46.

- 3 Walter Schlesinger, 'Herrschaft und Gefolgschaft in der germanisch-deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift* 176, 2 (1953), 225–75; Reinhard Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes* (Cologne and Graz, 1961), pp. 346–74; Otto Hötsch, 'Adel und Lehnwesen in Rußland und Polen und ihr Verhältnis zur deutschen Entwicklung', *Historische Zeitschrift* 108 (1912), 542–70; František Graus, 'Die Entstehung der mittelalterlichen Staates in Mitteleuropa', *Historica* 10 (1965), 38–53; Eric Hoffmann, 'Knut der Heilige und die Wende der dänische Geschichte im 11. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift* 218 (1974), 531, 550–3.
- 4 Faruk Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler), Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları* (Ankara, 1972), pp. 402–3; cf. Ergin, *Dede Korkut Kitabı*, II, pp. 338–9; Yaşar Yücel, *Kadı Burhaneddin Ahmed ve Devleti (1344–1398)* (Ankara, 1970), p. 69; Şinasi Tekin, 'XIV. Yüzyılda Yazılmış Gazilik Tarihleri "Gâziliğin Yolları" Adlı Bir Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Metni ve Gazâ/Cihâd Kavramları Hakkında', *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13 (1989), 141 n. 9; Enveri, *Le Destân d'Umür Pacha (Düstûrne-i Enveri)*, ed. Irène Mélikoff-Sayar (Paris, 1954), pp. 76, 78.
- 5 M. Fuad Köprülü, 'Alp', in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* [hereafter *İA*], vol. I (İstanbul, 1941), pp. 379–84; M. Fuad Köprülü, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Kuruluşu*, 2nd edn (Ankara, 1972), pp. 146–53; Şinasi Tekin, 'Türk Dünyasında Gazâ ve Cihâd Kavramları Üzerine Düşünceler. II. Gâzi Teriminin Anadolu ile Akdeniz Bölgesinde İtibârını Yeniden Kazanması', *Tarih ve Toplum* 19, 110 (1993), 77–8.

natural that the early followers of Ertuğrul and Osman are repeatedly referred to by such terms in the earliest Ottoman chronicles.⁶

Osman's entourage seems to have been heterogeneous, consisting of Turks (his closest, permanent followers and warriors from neighbouring lands who fought on a temporary basis), Byzantines, Catalans and – in small but increasing number – slaves.⁷ His retinue may have numbered a few hundred men at most. His allies and semi-independent companions also had their own retinues and sometimes acted on their own account. Apparently, they formed several smaller 'marches' within the larger Bithynian frontier.⁸ When they engaged in large-scale military adventures or faced enemy attacks, they joined their forces including the tribal warriors. This happened in 1301–2 at Bapheus and in 1329 at Pelekanon when possibly the entire force which could be mobilised from the Ottoman territory fought against the Byzantines.

At that time the Ottoman army consisted largely of mounted warriors with some supplementary infantry. The poet Aşık Paşa, who clearly regarded details of a warrior's weapons as important, portrayed the *alp* of his time in his *Garibname* (1330) as a soldier having a good horse, carrying a keen-edged sword (*kılıç*), bow (*yay*), arrows (*ok*) and lance (*süngü*), and bearing an impenetrable and awe-inspiring coat of mail (*ton*).⁹ As the conduct of the two battles mentioned above clearly shows, early Ottoman warfare was based largely on the ancient steppe tradition. Its principal elements included the avoidance of close combat, placing the mobile mounted troops in ambush, the feigned retreat with incessant shooting in order to disrupt the enemy's battle array, and repeated sudden attacks until the enemy became totally confused and fled.¹⁰ The greatest challenge was the conquest of the Byzantine fortresses

6 Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, vol. I, ed. N. Ciftçioglu, (Istanbul, 1949), pp. 107, 112 (*nökör*), pp. 98, 100, 105–6, 108 (*yoldaş*); Mehmed Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1949, 1957), I, pp. 120–1, 146–7; cf. Halil İnalcık, 'Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış', in *Osmanlı*, vol. I, ed. Güler Eren, Kemal Çiçek and Cem Oğuz (Ankara, 1999), pp. 51–5. At the same time both *alp* and *yoldaş* had a religious-mystical connotation meaning spiritual devotion ('companionship') to God and Sufi leaders; cf. Mine Mengi, 'Garib-namede Alplik Geleneğiyle İlgili Bilgiler', *Belleten* 48, 191–2 (1984–5), 488–95; Elvan Çelebi, *Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye Fi Menâsibi'l-Ünsiyye (Baba İlyas-ı Horasânî ve Silâlesinin Menkabevi Tarihî)*, ed. İsmail E. Erünsal and A. Yaşar Ocak (Ankara, 1995), for example, pp. 25/285, 58/653, 59/658, 82/936, 156/1822.

7 Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1995), pp. 122–38; Heath W. Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany, 2003), pp. 55–94, 114–43.

8 Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih*, pp. 99–100, 109; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 128–9.

9 Mengi, 'Garib-namede', 483–7.

10 Johannes Kantakouzenos, *Geschichte*, ed. Georgios Fatouros and Tilman Krischer, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1986), II, pp. 21–35; cf. N. Jorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches nach*

and fortified towns. In the earlier phase the Ottomans blockaded a town or fortress for years or even decades, setting up stockades and watch towers, and occupying and, when necessary, devastating the surrounding countryside.¹¹

It was during these prolonged blockades that villages or other sources of income began to be granted in order to provide for the subsistence of the retainers who were constantly under arms.¹² These assignments, which were allocated for the ‘nourishing’ or ‘feeding’ of the warriors in the strict sense, were called *timars*, a Persian term meaning care, forethought or solicitude, and the holder was called a *timar eri*. In this period the *timar* was an undifferentiated, general form of remuneration given to the grantee to enable him to make a living. This early stage is reflected in the fifteenth-century written sources where the concept of *timar*-holding is most often designated by the term ‘to eat a *timar*’ (*timar yemek*).¹³ It is worth noting that the armed retinue was similarly called ‘fed’, ‘nourished men’ (*threptos anthrōpos*) among the Danubian Bulgars, and in the Kievan Rus state the princely retainers, who were nominated governors, were assigned portions of princely revenues for ‘nourishment’ (*kormlenye*).¹⁴ Indications of the fact that the first *timar*-holders were chosen from among the members of the leaders’ retinues can also be detected in the fifteenth-century *timar* registers. A grant was most often made on the basis of what was referred to as *yoldaşlık* which alluded to participation in a campaign and the display of bravery, although originally – as was seen above – it only denoted companionship and the performing of (excellent) service as a retainer of a military leader.¹⁵

The origins of the *timar* system are still being disputed. Some scholars argue that it derives from the Seljuk *ikta*, others from the Byzantine *pronoia*.¹⁶

den Quellen dargestellt. Erster Band (bis 1451), vol. I (Gotha, 1908), pp. 165–7; Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington, 1983), pp. 25–6, 30–2.

¹¹ Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1650: the Structure of Power* (Handmills and New York, 2002), pp. 254–5.

¹² Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârîh*, p. 105; Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 122–3, 158–9. There is documentary evidence showing that this practice existed as early as under Orhan; see Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Le timar dans l'état ottoman (début XIVe–début XVIe siècle)* (Wiesbaden, 1980), p. 25.

¹³ Cf. e.g. Halil İnalcık (ed.), *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1987), *passim*.

¹⁴ V. Beševliev, *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1963), pp. 282–3; Igor Iakovlevich Froianov, *Kievskaiia Rus. Očerki socialno-politicheskoï istorii* (Leningrad, 1980), pp. 88–9; Uwe Holbach, *Der russische Fürstenhof vor 16. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1985), p. 100.

¹⁵ The notion of *yoldaşlık* is first attested to in a document of 1391; Lowry, *The Nature*, p. 62. In the early *timar* registers its synonyms are *erlik* and *şirmedlik*.

¹⁶ Gyula Káldy-Nagy, ‘The First Centuries of the Ottoman Military Organization’, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31, 2 (1977), 147; Mark C. Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204–1453* (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 184–5; Imber, *The Structure of Power*, pp. 194–6.

Whichever might prove true, the first *timars* were apparently hereditary, as were the appanages and estates (*mülk*, *vakıf*) assigned to family members, allies and military commanders.¹⁷ The principle and practice of heritability were not alien either to *ikta* of the Mongolian period, or to *pronoia* of the Palaeologan era.¹⁸ The size of the *timars* must have varied widely for, if credence can be given to the later chroniclers, prominent leaders could obtain entire former principalities as *timars*.¹⁹

The ruler and the major figures in the state had continuously to make up for their lost retainers who had settled on their *timars*. At the same time, the protracted sieges of Byzantine cities called for the creation of an efficient infantry. This dual challenge was met by Orhan, probably around 1330, when he set up an army of foot soldiers called *yaya* (literally ‘footman, infantry’) recruited from the people in his own territory. Owing to the lack of contemporary sources, we have to fall back on fifteenth–sixteenth-century tradition concerning these troops. The earliest material maintains that the *yayas* were the ruler’s own private (*has*) soldiers or armed escorts who replaced the *yoldaşes* and wore white caps (*ak börk*) to differentiate them from the retainers of other lords and the tribal warriors who all wore red caps.²⁰ Although another, later, stratum of the tradition claims that the *yayas* were recruited from among the tax-paying peasants (*reaya*), who served on a voluntary basis in return for exemption from various taxes and were given minimal pay (one or two *akçe* a day) during warfare, it is almost certain that this scheme reflects the realities of the fifteenth century projected with some distortions into the past.²¹ At any rate, the transformation must have been rapid and radical because the geographer al-‘Umari – undoubtedly exaggerating – reported in around 1331 that Orhan had 25,000 or 40,000 mounted troops and innumerable infantry.²²

17 Cf. Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih*, p. 104.

18 Alessio Bombaci, ‘The Army of the Saljuqs of Rûm’, *Annali Istituto Oriente di Napoli* 38, 28 (1978), 365; Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, pp. 179–82.

19 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 166–7; Feridun M. Emecen, *İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası* (Istanbul, 2003), p. 94.

20 Oruç, *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch*, ed. Franz Babinger (Hanover, 1925), pp. 15–16, 89–90; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih*, pp. 117–18; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 152–7.

21 Kemal Paşa-oğlu Şemsüddin Ahmed İbn-i Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, vol. II. *Defter*, ed. Şerafettin Turan (Ankara, 1983), pp. 49–51; Saadeddin, *Tâcü’t-tevârih*, vol. I. (Istanbul, 1279/1862–3), p. 40; cf. Muzaffer Arıkan, ‘Yaya ve Müsellemlerde Toprak Tasarrufu’, in *Atatürk Konferansları VIII. 1975–1976* (Ankara, 1983), pp. 179–80; Halime Doğru, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Yaya–Müsellemler–Taycı Teskilâtı* (XV. ve XVI. Yüzyılda Sultanönü Sancağı) (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 10–11.

22 Al-‘Umari, *Al-‘Umari’s Bericht über Anatolien in seinem Werke Masâlik al-abşâr fi mamâlik al-amşâr*, vol. I: *Text*, ed. Franz Taeschner (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 21, 41; cf. İbn Battuta, *Voyages*

Although there are hardly any reliable data available for the first half of the fourteenth century, a comparison between the thirteenth-century Seljuk and fifteenth-century Ottoman organisations suggests that the early Ottoman military administration and territorial division followed the Seljuk model. One of the key figures of the Seljuk military organisation during the Mongol domination was the *subaşı* (its Arabic and Persian synonyms being *zaim*, *şihna*, *ser-leşker*, *server*), who was consistently also called *bey* (*amir* in Arabic), the office he filled being called *zeamet*, *emaret*, *serveri* or *ser-leşkəri*. The *subaşı bey* or *zaim* governed a territorial unit called a *vilayet*, or a larger city, and was the commander (*zaimü'l-cüyuş*) of the *ikta*-holder cavalry (*sipahi*) and the fortress garrisons (*mustahfiz*) under his authority.²³ Comparing the information provided by a document of 1348 with data concerning *subaşı*s in official registers from the first half of the fifteenth century and the early chronicles, we find that the Ottoman territorial division was the immediate successor to the Seljuk system.²⁴ *Subaşı beys* (*zaimü'l-cüyuş*) remunerated by large *timars* were appointed to lead the *vilayets* or other territorial units of similar size (*il*). It was their duty to command the *timar eri* cavalry (also called *sipahis* after the Persian model) in military operations, while they also played a role in civil administration. Süleyman, son of Orhan, who appeared without any title in

d'Ibn Batoutah, vol. II: *Texte*, ed. and tr. C. Defrémery and R. Sanguinetti (Paris, 1877), pp. 321–2: 'Ce sultan est le plus puissant des rois Turkomans, le plus riche en trésors, en villes et en soldats.'

- 23 Osman Turan, *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmi Vesikalar. Metin, Tercüme, Araştırmalar* (Ankara, 1988), documents nos. 4–11, 16–17, 20–1; cf. Claude Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane* (Istanbul and Paris, 1988), pp. 197–201. The institution continued in the Aydın beylik too: Eflaki, *Les saints des derviches tourneurs*, ed. and tr. Cl. Huart, 2 vols. (Paris, 1918), II, pp. 391–2; cf. Himmet Akın, *Aydınogulları Tarihi Hakkında Bir Araştırma* (Ankara, 1968), pp. 15, 30; Enveri, *Le Destân d'Umûr Pacha*, pp. 50, 64, 116. For the traces of its survival in the state of Kadı Burhaneddin, see Yücel, *Kadı Burhaneddin Ahmed*, pp. 44, 65–6, 102.
- 24 The document has been published several times (cf. the references in I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Recherches sur les actes du règne des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I* (Munich, 1967), p. 106), e.g. by Gliša Elezović, *Turski spomenici*, vol. I, Parts 1–2 (Belgrade, 1940–52), part 1, pp. 1110–12, part 2, pp. 218–20; the *timar* registers used are: İnalçık, *Hicri 835 Tarihli, passim* and p. xxiii; Hazim Şabanović, *Krajište Isa-bega Ishakovića. Zbirni katastarski popis iz 1455. godine* (Sarajevo, 1964); Nikolai Todorov and Boris Nedkov, *Fontes Turcici Historiae Bulgaricae*, series XV–XVI, vol. XIII/II (Sofia, 1966), pp. 11–41, 119–231; Hamid Hadžibegić, Adem Handžić and Eşref Kovačević, *Oblast Brankovića. Opširni katastarski popis iz 1455. godine*, 2 vols. (Sarajevo, 1972); Dušanka Bojanić-Lukač, *Vidin i vidinski kat sandžak prez 15–16 vek* (Sofia, 1975), facs. pp. 1–111; Melek Delilbaşı and Muzaffer Arıkan, *Hicri 859 Tarihli Süret-i Defter-i Sancak-ı Tırhala*, 2 vols. (Ankara, 2001); from among the narrative sources see particularly Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 224–7, 242–3, 262–3, 276–7; for some further occurrences of the term in early documents: Lowry, *The Nature*, pp. 88–9 (1365–85); N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 26 (1397–8); Paul Wittek, 'Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden (I–VII)', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 54 (1958), 240 (1412) and 55 (1959), 125–6, 129 (1402: *şihne*).

a document of 1324 as a witness,²⁵ was described as *zaimü'l-cüyuş ve'l-asakir* and had also gained the title of *paşa* in the source of 1348 cited above. All this appears to confirm that later chroniclers mirrored the reality of the age faithfully, ascribing the titles *bey*, *subaşı* and *paşa* repeatedly to the noted *yaya* commanders and marcher lords (for instance, Evrenos) of the second half of the fourteenth century.²⁶

During the second third of the century, however, a new military-administrative unit was taking shape as a new organisational level above the *vilayets* or *subaşılıks*: the *sancak* (district or sub-province). Originally, the word meant flag or banner, and it designated an army unit or company without territorial connotation. Some scholars argue that the prototype of the territorial *sancak* is to be found in Orhan's grant of Bursa and its vicinity to his son Murad as 'the ruler's district' (*bey sancağı*) after the capture of İznik (1331).²⁷ Two factors may have played important roles in the subsequent multiplication of *sancaks*. First, there was a dynastic drive to curb the *subaşı*s with local, familial or tribal bonds by means of new military leaders more strongly dependent on the rulers. Second, probably as a result of military considerations and for reasons of consolidation, there was a tendency to incorporate the newly conquered Turkoman principalities into the Ottoman system by keeping their original boundaries, and the larger *sancak* must have been better suited to this purpose.²⁸

The rise of the classical Ottoman army, 1370s–1453

In the second half of the century, especially in the 1360s–70s, the Ottoman military underwent fundamental changes. These, and the following, decades witnessed the emergence and consolidation of the troops and structures that determined Ottoman warfare until the middle or end of the sixteenth century, and in some regards even much longer. In short, this was when the classical Ottoman war organisation emerged. We will discuss each of the main components in turn.

²⁵ Lowry, *The Nature*, p. 76.

²⁶ Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 246–7, 256–7, 262–3; Tunca Kortantamer, *Leben und Weltbild des altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Diwans* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1973), pp. 141–2; cf. İnalcık, *Hicri 835 Tarihli*, p. xxiv.

²⁷ Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 162–3; Kemal Paşa-oğlu, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, II, pp. 48; Emecen, *İlk Osmanlılar*, p. 93.

²⁸ Emecen, *İlk Osmanlılar*, pp. 95–9.

The timar-holding sipahis

By the last two decades of the fourteenth century, the *timar*-holding *sipahi* had become the backbone of the provincial army and of the whole Ottoman military organisation. The *sipahi* (also referred to as *timar eri*, *timar-hor*, *ehl-i timar*, *süvari*) was first and foremost a mounted soldier who had to perform military service in exchange for his prebend granted by the state (the grant was valid as long as he met his obligations). The timariots constituted the largest single unit among the various central and provincial troops. This was also due to the fact that the officers of other troops, of the peasant militias, auxiliary and paramilitary troops, as well as a considerable portion of the court mercenaries and garrison troops, were also incorporated into the *timar* system. There were many civil office-holders, too, who received *timars* in lieu of salary and many of them were also obligated to go to war, in the same way as the *sipahis* proper.²⁹

By the fifteenth century, therefore, the *timar*-holders were recruited from the most heterogeneous sources of manpower. In the first half of the century there was still a significant, but continuously decreasing number of old retainers described in the sources as ‘ancient’ (*kadimi*) or ‘of sipahi origin’ (*sipahi asıllı*) among the *timar*-holders.³⁰ They inherited the service and often the estate, or a part of it, over generations; sometimes even women or underage children were entitled to the estate provided that there was a relative who took care of them and someone who carried arms for them. The Muslim *sipahis* of the conquered Anatolian principalities and the Christians of Byzantine-Slav origin also belonged to this category; they had entered into Ottoman service in order to keep at least parts of their privileges and old *ikta*, *pronoia* or *baştina* estates. The importance of the latter is evidenced by the following figures: 18 per cent of all *timars* in Arvanid (Albania) in 1431–2 and 17 per cent of the *timars* in the district of Tirhala in Greece in 1454–5 were in the possession of Christian *sipahis*.³¹

The central power had long been determined to increase the *timar*-holders’ dependency and to complement or replace them with elements more closely tied to it. The first aim was ensured by the method of mass deportation:

29 Vera P. Mutafchieva, *Agrarian Relations in the Ottoman Empire in the 15th and 16th Centuries* (Boulder, 1988), pp. 1–60; N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 38–46.

30 On the term *kadimi*, see Nicoară Beldiceanu and P. S. Năsturel, ‘La Thessalie entre 1454/55 et 1506’, *Byzantion* 53, 1 (1983), 110–11.

31 Halil İnalçık, ‘1431 Tarihli Timar Defterine Göre Fatih Devrinden Önce Timar Sistemi’, in *IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara, 1948* (Ankara, 1952), p. 137; Delilbaşı and Arıkan, *Hicri 859 Tarihli*, p. xli; for a general survey of the subject, see Halil İnalçık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, vol. I (Ankara, 1987), pp. 137–84; Halil İnalçık, ‘Ottoman Methods of Conquest’, *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954), 104–29.

Anatolian *timar*-holders were transferred to Rumeli and those from Rumeli sent to Anatolia in order to detach them from their native environments.³² Able-bodied peasants and other volunteers who had shown bravery had also had access for some time to *timar*-estates. However, the most important means for the centralisation of the *timar* system was to grant the estates of 'ancient' and other traditional *sipahis* to soldiers of slave origin who came from the sultan's household and acted as local agents of the ruler. This constantly expanding group of *timar*-holders was called *gulam-i mir* (in Turkish *bey kulu*), since the rulers had most frequently been referred to by the title *mir* or *bey* until the early fifteenth century.³³ In the frontier districts with special status (see below), the marcher lords in the main recruited new *timar*-holders from among their followers of slave origin or status (*gulam*, *nöker*, *hizmetkar*). As a result, the *sipahis*' position as a status-group (also manifest in the treatment of the sons of *sipahis* as a separate legal category) gradually vanished, and the *timar* became more and more closely tied to service.³⁴

The main duty of a timariot was to go to war when summoned, taking with him the required weaponry and a certain prescribed number of armed retainers (*cebelü*). These obligations were determined in proportion to his revenue. For a considerable period there was apparently no uniform regulation valid for the whole of the empire, and thus the same amount of revenue could at times entail widely differing obligations. By the same token, it seems that no effort was made before the second half of the fifteenth century to create a more distinct separation between the ordinary prebends, which carried the obligation of going to war (*eşkün timarı*), and the prebends of fortress troops, granted in lieu of salary (*hisar eri/müstahfiz timarı*) but which in practice could also entail going to war (*eşmek*). Towards the end of Murad II's reign reforms may have been introduced in both aspects of the system since the *defters* surviving from the middle of the century stipulated the quota of *cebelüs* to be mobilised and listed other obligations following the same principles as the central law code promulgated in 1501.³⁵

32 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, 1-4 (1949-50), see particularly 215-29; İnalcık, 'Ottoman Methods of Conquest', 122-5.

33 The terms *gulam-i mir/bey kulu* have generally and erroneously been interpreted in scholarly literature as denoting the servants, slaves (the 'men') of the district governors; cf. e.g. N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 88-9.

34 Nihat Azamat (ed), *Anonim Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osman – F. Giese Neşri* (Istanbul, 1992), p. 34; cf. Grignaschi, 'Les guerriers domestiques', pp. 226-7.

35 The latter edited by Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Code de lois coutumière de Mehmed II. Kitâb-i Qavânîn-i 'Örfiyye-i 'Osmânî* (Wiesbaden, 1967), ff. 9v-10r.

Table 1 *The obligations of the timariots according to the categories of revenue (mid-fifteenth century)*

Akçe	Obligation
1,000	the timar-holder (<i>cebelü</i>)
2,000	the timar-holder (<i>cebelü</i>) + 1 <i>gulam</i>
3,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 1 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i>
4,000, 4,500, 5,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 1 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>tentküür</i>
5,500, 6,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 2 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>tentküür</i>
7,500, 8,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 2 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>tentküür</i>
9,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 3 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
10,000, 10,500, 11,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 3 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
12,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 4 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
13,500, 14,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 4 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
15,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 5 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
16,500, 17,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 5 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
18,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 6 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>
19,500, 20,000	the timar-holder (<i>bürüme</i>) + 6 <i>cebelü</i> + 1 <i>gulam</i> + 1 <i>çadır</i>

Sources: Šabanović, *Krajište*; Todorov and Nedkov, *Fontes Turcici*, pp. 11–41, 119–231; Hadžibegić et al., *Oblast Brankovića*; Bojanić-Lukač, *Vidin i vidinskijat sandžak*, pp. 55–90, facs. 1–111; Delilbaşı and Arıkan, *Hicrî 859 Tarihi*; cf. Beldiceanu, *Code*, ff. 9v–10r.

The weaponry of the ordinary *timariots* consisted of a coat of mail (*cebe*) or a *cevşen* (coat of mail reinforced with iron or steel lamellae), mail coif and turban (*mücevveze*), bow (*yay*), arrows (*ok*), broad arrow-heads (*bilek/bilik*), javelin (*gönder*), shield (*kalkan*) and a lightly curved sabre (*kılıç*).³⁶ Those whose annual revenue was 3,000 *akçe* or above had to wear the so-called *bürüme* instead of the *cebe*; this was a mail-and-plate armour that was fixed on a leather garment or a dress of several layers of cloth and covered a much greater part of the body than the *cebe*.³⁷ As Table 1 shows, a timariot was obliged to bring a man-at-arms with him for every 3,000 *akçe* of income. Further, he was also expected to bring a young servant (*gulam*, sometimes called *nöker*) and various tents (*tentküür*, *çadır*) if his income exceeded a certain figure. Most of the *cebelüs* were chosen from among the sons, relatives and (at least in the Balkans) Christian

³⁶ David Nicolle and Angus McBride, *Armies of the Ottoman Turks 1300–1774* (London, 1983), pp. 22–3 (with some errors). Useful for the identification of weaponry are H. Russell Robinson, *Oriental Armour* (London, 1967), particularly pp. 53–71, 77; Zdzisław Żygulski, *Stara broń w polskich zbiorach* (Warsaw, 1982); David Nicolle and Christa Hook, *Saracen Fairs 1050–1250 AD* (London, Auckland and Melbourne, 1994; reprinted 1997).

³⁷ N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 83–4.

subjects, and not infrequently, from among the freed slaves (*azadegan*) of the timariots.³⁸

In the first half of the fifteenth century the average income of the *timars* seems to have been relatively modest. In 1431–2, 70 per cent of estates in the district of Arvanid were in the income category of 500 to 3,000 *akçe*. Hence, a considerable number of recipients were not obliged to provide men-at-arms.³⁹ On the other hand, the number of *timars* and that of the timariots differed considerably because many of the estates (as was also the case with the Byzantine *pronoias*) were held jointly by two or more timariots who usually, though not always, went to war on a rotating basis. The importance of this can be illustrated with the help of the *defter* of Tırhala (1454–5). Apart from those of the commanders, a total of 192 (159 ordinary and 33 garrison) *timars* were registered, ‘eaten’ by a total of 291 persons (including 15 under age). The 159 ordinary *timars* provided for 175 *sipahi* and 213 armed retainers, that is, a total of 388 men. Thus a *timar* provided an average of 2.44 people for war per annum and maintained 2.88 people (excluding women and other relatives).⁴⁰ These figures indicate that, however small the average income appears to be, it was sufficient for the system to run smoothly.

Some holders of collective estates, and a few individual landowners, enjoyed the privilege of not performing active military service unless the sultan or the provincial governor led the campaign in person. In all other cases they could send a man-at-arms or a son in their place. A *cebelü* or *eşkıncı* could also replace the owner of a private estate who was under the obligation of going to war (*eşkıncülü mülk*).⁴¹

From our sources it can be inferred that with the passage of time the changes among prebend-holders gradually increased. The major reasons for reassigning *timars* included a timariot’s failure to report for service, premature return from war, leaving the estate and resignation. *Timars* were very often transferred to other holders owing to losses in war, especially along the frontiers, as indicated by the entry ‘dead’ (*mürde*) in the *defters*. The change in the attitude of the central power referred to above – the mass penetration of the sultan’s *gulams* into the ranks of *timar*-holders – also contributed to the constant mobility among the *sipahis*.

38 Cf. e.g. Delilbaşı and Arıkan, *Hicrî 859 Tarihli*, p. 206.

39 Mutařchieva, *Agrarian Relations*, p. 28.

40 The calculation was made by the present author.

41 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, ‘Osmanlı Devrinin ‘Eşkıncülü Mülkler’i Veya ‘Mülk Timarlar’ı Hakkında Notlar’, in 60. *Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Toğan’a Armağan* (İstanbul, 1950–5), pp. 61–70. Republished in Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Türkiye’de Toprak Meselesi. Toplu Eserler 1* (İstanbul, 1980), pp. 897–904.

The timariots were expected to live in the district where their estates were situated. The cavalry of a *nahiye* (originally a military, later a territorial unit)⁴² was commanded by a *çeribaşı* or *serasker* (literally ‘commander of the army’) who was remunerated with a larger *timar*. From the description by Georgius de Hungaria, who wrote in the mid-fifteenth century, we know that the *sipahis*, placed under the *çeribaşıs*, were divided into hundreds.⁴³ Several *nahiyes* made up a *vilayet* or *subaşılik* headed by the *subaşı*. His prebend (towards the end of the period, the one-time Seljuk designations *zaim* and *ziamet* appeared again for the *subaşı* and his holding, respectively) was generally termed *has* and his yearly income could amount to more than 100,000 *akçe*.⁴⁴ Around the mid-fifteenth century, *subaşıs* were in charge of deploying a retainer for every 4,000 *akçe* of their revenues, and bringing with them one set of horse armour (*geçim*), three tents (two *çadır* and one *tenktür*) and one young servant (*gulam*) for every 30,000 *akçe*.⁴⁵

From the last decades of the fourteenth century, the supreme commandship of the timariots in the district rested with the governor (*sancakbeyi*, or *mir-i liva* in Arabic)⁴⁶ who was granted the privilege of having his own military band and standard (*tabl ve alem*). The existence of this office is first attested to in a diploma of 1391.⁴⁷ By the 1430s the number of the *sancaks* had risen to thirteen in Rumeli and sixteen in Anatolia, and it was constantly increasing as a result of new conquests.⁴⁸ In the few instances which are known, the annual revenue of the district governors’ *has*-estates always exceeded 200,000 *akçe* and was mostly of the order of 300,000 to 500,000 *akçe*. The *sancakbeyi* had to field one armed retainer for every 5,000 *akçe* of his income, as well as one set of horse armour and a specified number of tents for every 50,000 *akçe*, to be used, for example, for the kitchen, treasury, pantry or saddlery.⁴⁹ The officially designated followers of the governors and *subaşıs* constituted a considerable part (20–30 per cent) of the district’s military strength, not to mention their innumerable non-official retainers whom they ‘fed’ at their own expense. It was a custom to leave a small percentage of the *sipahis* at home for the defence

42 Zeki Arkan, XV–XVI. Yüzyıllarda Hamit Sancağı (Izmir, 1988), pp. 36–7, 42.

43 Georgius de Hungaria, ‘Incipit prohemium in tractatum de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia Turcorum’. Értékezés a törökök szokásairól, viszonyairól és gonoszságáról 1438–1458, Hungarian translation by Győző Kenéz, in *Rabok, követek, kalmárok az oszmán birodalomról*, ed. Lajos Tardy (Budapest, 1977), p. 84.

44 E.g. Todorov and Nedkov, *Fontes Turcici*, pp. 77, 122–3, 287.

45 N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 78–81.

46 Cf. Delilbaşı and Ankan, *Hicri 859 Tarihli*, p. 1. 47 Lowry, *The Nature*, p. 62.

48 Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, ‘Lauro Quirini and the Turkish Sandjaks (ca. 1430)’, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 11 (1987), 239–47.

49 N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 76–7.

of the district. The *sancaks* along the borders of the empire were entrusted to so-called 'marcher lords' (*uç beyi*) who enjoyed special privileges (see below).

Sometime in the last third of the fourteenth century, the Rumelian and, slightly later around 1393, the Anatolian districts were organised into separate provinces (*beylerbeyilik* or *vilayet*). In 1413, a third province came into being in central Anatolia with Amasya as its centre, but the military role of its leader remained insignificant in comparison with that of the first two.⁵⁰ The governor-general (*beylerbeyi*) of Rumeli had his residence at Sofia, while that of Anatolia was either at Ankara or later at Kütahya. There were perhaps two concerns underlying the central administration's creation of these offices. First, it desired to curtail the political power of the *beys* by placing above them a supreme commander of slave origin whose loyalty was unquestionable; and second, it wished to secure the unified military command of the territorial districts and the infantry districts (*yaya sancakları*, see below) which were being established simultaneously at that time.

The governor-general, who also had the title *paşa*, commanded the entire army of his province, including infantry and auxiliary contingents. In the main it was he who granted *timars* to applicants on his own authority, issuing his own documents of assignment (called, among other terms, *biti* or *mektub*). Measured by the standards of the time, his official *has*-holding was extraordinarily large, enabling him to maintain a considerable household and 'private army' which in most cases numbered more than a thousand men. According to some later information, about one-third of these men received full equipment including a coat of mail or mail-and-plate armour, and many of their horses were harnessed with armour.⁵¹

The total potential and the mobilisable strength of the timariot army is not known for any precise period, but taking the number of the districts into account and calculating on the basis of the few extant *defters*, it can be said that the *sancaks* of Rumeli and Anatolia may have been able to deploy 10,000 to 15,000 *sipahis* for the imperial campaigns during the 1430s and 1440s.

The marcher districts (uç beylikleri) and the akıncıs

Within the provincial organisation, the so-called marcher districts had a special position. Their leaders (*uç beyleri*) usually came from old state-founder

50 İlhan Şahin, 'XV ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı Taşra Teşkilatının Özellikleri', in *XV ve XVI. Asırları Türk Asrı Yapan Değerler*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (Istanbul, 1999), p. 123. According to Imber (*The Structure of Power*, p. 179) the third *vilayet* was created in the 1390s.

51 Iacopo de Promontorio, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis über den Osmanenstaat um 1475*, ed. Franz Babinger (Munich, 1957), pp. 47–8, 55–6.

families who passed their posts down from father to son. Such families included the Evrenos, Mihaloğlu, Malkoç and Paşa Yiğit clans and their descendants.⁵² They possessed thousands of slaves and private troops as well as huge hereditary estates, and they allocated *timar*-estates within their jurisdiction, acting practically as vassals rather than subjects of the sultan. Their main duty was to watch the neighbouring countries, prepare for their conquest by annual raiding and merciless devastation, contribute to the maintenance of the war machine by acquiring booty and provide slaves by seizing captives in war and raids. In military campaigns they were assigned the tasks of scouting and constant harassment of the enemy, pillaging enemy territory, securing deployment routes and guarding the baggage train.

To carry out these tasks they had at their disposal, in addition to the timariots, enormous numbers of *akıncıs* (raiders) living in their districts. The raiders were descendants of nomadic tribal warriors who had withdrawn to the frontiers and who emerged as a distinct military body in the late fourteenth century. They lived by livestock rearing and bred excellent horses that were able to cover, on little fodder, three or four times the distance achieved by an ordinary horse.⁵³ The *akıncıs* made a living by selling the spoils at good prices. Captured boys who seemed fit for military service were bought or seized by the sultan's officials. Though the majority of the raiders were professional soldiers, in the period under discussion their numbers were often augmented by volunteers, Muslims and Christians alike. According to the few and often unreliable sources we have, they numbered some 10,000 to 20,000 and were probably divided from the outset into groups of 10, 100 and 1,000. Their weaponry was adapted to their form of warfare: they usually had only a sword, lance, shield, and perhaps a mace, and wore a typical red headgear to distinguish them. A large number of the volunteers were poorly armed, carrying only a club in their hands.⁵⁴ Their officers were *tovcas* (a word of Mongolian origin), who had the same rank as the *çeribaşıs* of the timariots and like them usually received *timar*-estates by way of remuneration. The commander-in-chief was the marcher lord who was therefore also called *akıncı beyi*.

52 Halil İnalcık, 'The Rise of the Ottoman Empire', in *A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, ed. M. A. Cook (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 31–7; Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'En marge d'un acte concernant le penğyek et les aqıngı', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 37 (1969), 26–38; Imber, *The Structure of Power*, pp. 260–5; H. Çetin Arslan, *Türk Akıncı Beyleri ve Balkanların İmarına Katkıları (1300–1451)* (Ankara, 2001); Lowry, *The Nature*, pp. 45–94.

53 Georgius de Hungaria, 'Incipit', p. 64–7; Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs of a Janissary*, trans. Benjamin Stolz, notes Svat Soucek (Ann Arbor, 1975), p. 177.

54 Doukas, *Decline and Fall*, p. 134; Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d'Outremer de la Bertrandon de la Broquière*, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), p. 185.

The salaried troops of the court (kapukulu ocakları)

Janissary infantry

In the second half of the fourteenth century the ruler's entourage was transformed into a more complex household and court modelled on Islamic military slavery. As part of this process, the *yayas* of his retinue had been gradually relegated to the status of provincial soldiers and their place occupied by a combined force of salaried court troops.

The first in the series of the new-style household warriors were the janissaries (*yeniçeri*, literally 'new army'). The supposition that their name originated from the Catalan *genetari*/*ginetari* and was transmitted through the Byzantine term *ianitzaroi* seems to be unfounded.⁵⁵ This infantry corps (*ocak*) was most likely established in the 1370s, and initially consisted of perhaps a thousand men at most who were divided into hundreds commanded by *yayabaşıs*, a clear indication of their close relation to the *yayas*.⁵⁶ The first janissaries were enlisted from among the prisoners of war who entered the corps immediately and – as later janissary tradition maintains – received a two-*akçe* salary a day. According to the same tradition, this practice changed soon afterwards: novices were enrolled after serving five years on ships sailing up and down between the two shores of the Straits.⁵⁷ The next step was to introduce two new methods in order to place recruitment on a more solid basis. The first of these was to take one-fifth of the captives acquired in enemy territories during military operations. This institution, which was based on Islamic precepts concerning the division of spoils, was called *pencik*, from Persian *penc u yek*, 'one-fifth'. Recruits coming from this source were called *pencik oğlanı* by the Ottomans.⁵⁸ The second was to collect the children of the Christian subjects of the empire at different intervals (once in five to twelve years, alternating the provinces) and at varying rates: one boy per forty households may have been most typical. This system and the recruits supplied by it was known as *devşirme* (literally 'collection'), but Konstantin Mihajlović, himself a janissary between 1456 and 1463, calls the boys collected within the

55 Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, 'Les "janissaires" de l'empereur byzantin', in *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, ed. Aldo Gallotta and Ugo Marazzi (Napoli, 1982), pp. 591–7.

56 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları*, vol. I: *Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı* (Ankara, 1984), p. 144; Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Recherches*, pp. 203–11; Mücteba İlgürel, 'Yeniçeriler', in *İA*, VIII, pp. 385–95; Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, pp. 139–40.

57 *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân*, in Ahmed Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukûkî Tahlilleri*, vol. IX (Istanbul, 1996), pp. 133–4, 270.

58 Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'En marge d'un acte', pp. 38–43; *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân*, pp. 139, 274.

Ottoman realm *çilik*; a distorted Persian word meaning ‘one in forty’, thus confirming the supposition that this rate may have been in force at that time.⁵⁹ The same author also maintains that the janissaries of *pencik* and *devşirme* (*çilik*) origin had different legal status.⁶⁰ Recent studies tend to accept that these two forms of manpower supply were probably first applied by the marcher lords and later borrowed from them by the sultans. There is sufficient evidence to claim that the *devşirme*, in a sense the extension of the one-fifth levy to the sultan’s own domain, was already in existence in the 1380s.⁶¹

Once selected, the janissary novices received education and military training. The first reliable information on how this happened is provided by Georgius de Hungaria, who lived in the empire between 1438 and 1458. He relates that the ruler distributed the novices among the households of the magnates in his dominion where they were taught morals and the handling of weapons. At the age of twenty they returned to the court and became the sultan’s salaried infantrymen.⁶² Though Georgius does not mention it, we may suppose that many of the apprentices were brought up in the ruler’s court. During the early years of Mehmed II’s reign a new and totally different method of training was introduced.⁶³

At the beginning, all the janissaries served as the ruler’s bodyguard; they were his ‘companions’ or ‘retainers’ (*yoldaş*). As time went by, their number and tasks gradually, and constantly, increased. As a result, a special unit consisting of fifty to sixty men was selected from among them and given the name *solak*. Led by the *solakbaşı* and with bows in their hands they marched before the ruler. In the first half of the fifteenth century, large numbers of janissaries were sent to the provincial fortresses to man the garrisons and act as the ruler’s local representatives.

The head of the janissary corps was given the title *ağa*. The first holder of this office, a certain Mehmed, appears in a document of 1389, where he is said to have led 2,000 infantry (*piyade*) archers at the battle of Kosovo.⁶⁴

59 Basilike D. Papoulia, *Ursprung und Wesen der ‘Knabenlese’ im Osmanischen Reich* (Munich, 1963); Victor L. Ménage, ‘Some Notes on the Devşirme’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29 (1966), 64–78.; Victor L. Ménage, ‘Devşirme’, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–) [henceforth *El2*], II, pp. 210–13.

60 Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 159.

61 Vassilis Demetriades, ‘Some Thoughts on the Origins of the Devşirme’, in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. Elizabeth A. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1993), pp. 23–33.

62 Georgius de Hungaria, ‘Incipit’, p. 74.

63 *Kavânin-i Yeniçeriyân*, pp. 135, 271. From this time on they were sold to Turkish farmers where they remained about seven or eight years, learnt Turkish and became accustomed to hard work.

64 Káldy-Nagy, ‘The First Centuries’, p. 165.

After the *ağa* in the hierarchy came his deputy, followed by the *yayabaşıs* who commanded the main units (*orta*) of a hundred men each, with the lowest ranking officer being the corporal. In 1451 the keepers of the sultan's hounds (*sekbani*) were attached to the corps.⁶⁵ Before this date, the total strength of the corps did not exceed 3,000 men, but soon afterwards it rose to about 5,000.⁶⁶ Each of the ordinary janissaries received three to five *akçe* pay a day and a yearly allowance of garments as well as a certain amount of cash for buying a bow. The distinctive feature of their uniform was their white headgear (*zerkūlah*) with a flap turned backward.⁶⁷ Their basic armament included a bow, sabre, shield and light coat of mail. Some units also used crossbows (*zenberek*), others – mainly during the 1440s – were increasingly equipped with hand guns, and there were contingents which employed pole-arms – lances, halberds, war-axes (*balta*, *naçak*) – instead of or in addition to some of the weapons mentioned above.⁶⁸ From the turn of the fourteenth century, the janissaries played a crucial role both in the guarding of the ruler's person during pitched battles and in the assaults on enemy fortresses.

The salaried horsemen

The second main component of the central standing army was the six cavalry regiments, referred to as *altı bölük halkı* in later sources. The most prestigious among them were the *sipahi oğlanları* (cavalry youths) and the *silahdar* (armbearers), followed by the *ulufeci* (salaried men) of the right and the left wings, and the *garib yiğitleri* (foreigners) of the right and the left wings. They were mostly paid in cash and the amount of their salary reflected their prestige within the court hierarchy. Owing to the lack of reliable evidence, it is impossible to establish the date and the sequence of their foundation. If we consider, however, a short, and often misunderstood, notice in the Ottoman

65 Kritoboulos, *Vie de Mahomet II*, tr. Th. A. Dethier (Budapest, n.d.), pp. 24–5; Uzunçarşılı, *Kapukulu Ocakları*, I, pp. 163–4; İnalcık, *Fatih Devri*, p. 118.

66 *Ordo portae* – *Description grècque de la porte et de l'armée du Sultan Mehmed II*, ed. and tr. Şerif Baştaş (Budapest, 1947), pp. 6–7; Peter Schreiner, 'Eine Zweite Handschrift des "Ordo Portae" und der Wegbeschreibung in das Gebiet des Uzun Hasan. Mit einer Hypothese zur Verfasserfrage', *Südost-Forschungen* 41 (1982), 11, 15, 17; cf. Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 159, 163.

67 A. Pertusi, 'Le notizie sulla organizzazione amministrativa e militare dei Turchi nello "Strategicon adversum Turcos" di Lampo Birago (c.1453–1455)', in *Studi sul medioevo cristiano offerti a Raffaello Morghen per il 90 anniversario dell'Istituto Storico Italiano* (1883–1973), vol. II (Rome, 1974), p. 697.

68 Gábor Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan: Military Power and the Weapons Industry in the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 23; İnalcık, *Fatih Devri*, p. 182; David Nicolle and Christa Hook, *The Janissaries* (London, Auckland and Melbourne, 1995), pp. 20–1.

chronicles⁶⁹ and the fact that the hierarchy of ranks within the Ottoman military was often determined according to the time of establishment, we may suppose that the *sipahi oğlanları* and the *silahdar* were first organised, most probably, in the second half of the 1370s.⁷⁰ Some indirect evidence in the 1431–2 *timar* register and narrative sources suggests that the *garib yiğitleri* were actually recruited from uprooted or foreign elements arriving either from outside the realm or from diverse ethnic, mainly Tatar, groups.⁷¹ The bulk of the other divisions was enlisted from the graduates of the palace and, in the case of the *silahdar* and the *sipahi oğlanları*, from the janissaries who were promoted in this manner.⁷² Each of the regiments was commanded by an *ağa*.

The strength of the court horsemen before 1453 cannot be accurately established. Yet, from Konstantin Mihajlović's description an estimate of their number as being between 1,000 and 2,000 seems realistic.⁷³ They were armed with bow, sword, lance and shield. Their weapons and armour were provided by the ruler; some of them (about one-third) received cuirasses, others were given coats of mail, helmets and – in smaller numbers – horse armour. Together with the janissaries, the cavalrymen accompanied the ruler on campaign, carried his arms, led his horses, and stood round him to left and right during field battles.⁷⁴

The artillery corps (*topçı*) and the armourers (*cebeci*)

Though we have no evidence at our disposal, it is assumed that during Murad II's reign a separate salaried corps of court artillery was set up. This assumption is based on those findings which show the existence of professional cannoneers remunerated with *timars* during the reign of Bayezid I and Mehmed I.⁷⁵ At any rate, a contemporary Ottoman source mentions a *topçibaşı* (chief gunner) in 1444 which implies that a separate unit may have existed under his command.⁷⁶ The advanced state of Mehmed II's early artillery also supports this hypothesis, for his cannoneers could not have operated so effectively without skilled forerunners.

69 Saadeddin, *Tâcü't-tevârih*, I, p. 94. 70 Uzunçarşılı, *Kapıkulu Ocakları*, II, p. 147.

71 See Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 159, 161; Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Demonstrationes*, ed. Eugenius Darkó, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1922–7), II, p. 9 (he states that *garibs* came from as far as Egypt and Libya).

72 Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Demonstrationes*, II, p. 9.

73 Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 159, 161.

74 Iacopo de Promontorio, *Die Aufzeichnungen*, pp. 31–2.

75 Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, pp. 20, 28.

76 Halil İnalcık and Mevlud Oğuz (eds.) *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd b. Mehmed Hân. İzladî ve Varna Savaşları (1443–1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavât-nâme* (Ankara, 1978), pp. 47–8.

While the sources are silent on the *topçıs*, a small unit of *cebeci* (armourers) appears already to have existed at the court in the period under discussion. They may have numbered fifty to sixty men at most. They cleaned, repaired and in part manufactured the arms of the court salaried troops, first and foremost those of the janissaries. According to Konstantin Mihajlović they too were mounted soldiers and were under the command of an officer called *cebecibaşı*.⁷⁷

Fortress garrisons

Occupied fortresses and fortified cities were brought entirely under central control because the government regarded them as the means and symbol of the territorial integrity of the empire and of the strength of the sultan's power. The court used an increasing number of the janissaries and other salaried court troops (*gulam-i mir*) for this purpose. These troops were probably already entering service in the provincial fortresses on a rotating basis at this time. Further, more and more *gulams* were appointed to the post of fortress captain. The other, larger, part of the garrisons was recruited from provincial troops including a large number of Christians and renegades, especially in the Balkans.⁷⁸

The fortress guard was called *hisar eri*, *müstahfiz* or *merd-i kale*, the fortress captain *dizdar* and his deputy *kethüda*, all, apart from *hisar eri*, terms of Persian origin. The soldiers were divided into units of ten men each commanded by a decurion (*bölükbaşı*). The majority were simple infantrymen complemented by several special units such as arbalesters, guards, store men, musicians, craftsmen and armourers. In the first half of the fifteenth century new units were also drafted and integrated into the garrisons, particularly in fortresses along the frontiers: the artillerymen, the *voynuks* and the *martaloses* (see below). In major riverside fortresses waterborne units were in service, headed by the *kapudan* (captain).

The remuneration and service of the fortress troops were wide ranging. Some received *timars*, others salaries, and the combination of the two could also occur. Collective *timars* were frequent, and, as with the *sipahis*, many fortress soldiers served on a rotating basis. A considerable part of the garrisons consisted of local elements of semi-military and peasant origin who rendered service in return for exemption from certain taxes, most frequently from

⁷⁷ Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 163.

⁷⁸ In addition to the cited *timar* registers, see further esp. Todorov and Nedkov, *Fontes Turcici*, pp. 235–70; Hadžibegić *et al.*, *Oblast Brankovića*, ff. 142v–144r. On the fortress garrisons in general, see N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 81–2; Olga Zirojević, *Tursko vojno uređenje u Srbiji (1459–1683)* (Belgrade, 1974), pp. 105 ff.

poll-tax and extraordinary war taxes. They manufactured arms or ammunition, shields, arrows and ropes, for example, built and repaired the fortress walls, bridges, moats and ships, undertook regular patrols, and (sometimes also on a rotating basis) served as artillerymen and arbalesters. There were large stockpiles of arms and food in the fortresses but the latter were only drawn upon during sieges. At other times, each soldier was responsible for his daily subsistence at his own expense.

Peasant soldiers, peasant and town militias

From the latter half of the fourteenth century, the Ottoman standing army was supplemented by a whole range of paramilitary units and peasant militias. Some were ‘invented’ by the Ottomans, others were found in the conquered countries and integrated into their own system with minor alterations.⁷⁹

Azabs

Hardly any factual information survives about the *azabs* prior to the second half of the fifteenth century, although apparently they constituted one of the pillars of the Ottoman war machine. The word *azab*, meaning unmarried, occurs in the fourteenth-century Levant and west Anatolia denoting seamen or pirates, whereas in the Ottoman army they seem to have been land foot soldiers who were enlisted from the peasants for the duration of a campaign.⁸⁰ Tradition puts the emergence of the *azab* army before that of the janissaries, but the chronicles mentioned them with increasing frequency in connection with the wars at the end of the century and the domestic strife of the early fifteenth century.⁸¹

By the 1420s the method of their recruitment may already have been the following: a fixed number (ten to twenty) of peasant and craftsman households had to supply a suitable young man and provide his campaigning costs.⁸² The archer *azabs*, who sometimes also carried lances, were usually deployed in front of the battle array of the court troops and thus – especially with the

79 The best general survey to date is Klára Hegyi, ‘Magyar és balkáni katonaparasztok a budai vilájet déli szandzsákjaiban’, *Századok* 135, 6 (2001), 1255–72.

80 Enveri, *Le Destân d’Umûr Pacha*, pp. 54, 64; M. Fuad Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, ‘Azab’, in *İA*, II, pp. 81–3; Ernst Werner, *Die Geburt einer Grossmacht – Die Osmanen (1300–1481). Ein Beitrag zur Genesis des türkischen Feudalismus* (Weimar, 1985), pp. 206–7.

81 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 248–9, 290–1; Azamat, *Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, pp. 61–2.

82 Pál Fodor, ‘The Way of a Seljuq Institution to Hungary: the *Cerehôr*’, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 38, 3 (1984), 377–8 and n. 38.

spread of firearms and artillery – would suffer considerable losses.⁸³ Narrative sources put their number in important battles at tens of thousands⁸⁴ and list their commander (*azab ağası*) among the most prestigious statesmen.⁸⁵ Later infantry *azabs* also appear among the regular soldiers of castle garrisons, and river and naval fleets, but it is not yet clarified how the three troops were connected apart from having the same name.⁸⁶

Yayas and müsellems

As mentioned above, by the end of the fourteenth century, the *yaya* (or *piyade* in Persian) footmen had been transformed into provincial soldiers and their number constantly increased. This was achieved partly by recruiting and settling tribal nomad warriors and partly by conscripting peasants into the *yaya* corps. During the last decades of the century they were provided with farms with special legal status (*yayalık yer*) to meet the expenses of their campaigning.⁸⁷ In fact, they may have been free peasant soldiers who enjoyed their lands in return for military service. They can be found everywhere in the areas occupied in the fourteenth century: in eastern Thrace and the Maritsa valley, as well as the western and west-central parts of Asia Minor. There is enough evidence to suppose that the widely scattered *yayas* were organised into non-territorial districts independently of the timariot cavalry (*atlı*) *sancaks* and placed under the command of the *yayabaşı*, who usually also had the rank of *subaşı*. The later chronicles mention several of them by name as participants of the wars in the 1380s–90s, while Ulu bey *subaşı*, also called Sarı müddin Saruca Paşa, is indicated as the chief commander of the Rumelian footmen (*Rum iliniün yayabaşısı*). This person, who is presumed to have belonged to the marcher lords, played a crucial role in settling the *yayas*, providing them with land and establishing their organisation.⁸⁸

83 For their importance, see İnalçık and Oğuz, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd*, pp. 21, 23, 56–7, 59, 63–5; Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 165, 167.

84 Enveri, *Fatih Devri Kaynaklarından Düstûrnâme-i Enveri Osmanlı Tarihi Kısmı* (1299–1466), ed. Necdet Öztürk (Istanbul, 2003), p. 31; Oruç, *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch*, pp. 25, 34.

85 Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârîh*, p. 185; Azamat, *Anonim Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osman*, pp. 54, 76; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 652–5.

86 Tursun Bey, *Târîh-i Ebû'l-Feth*, ed. Mertol Tulum (Istanbul, 1977), pp. 48, 79; cf. M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlâd-i Fâtihân* (Istanbul, 1957), p. 41 n. 2; İdris Bostan, *Osmanlı Bahriye Teşkilâtı: XVII. Yüzyılda Tersâne-i Âmire* (Ankara, 1992), pp. 51–2.

87 İnalçık, *Hicri 835 Tarihli*, pp. xv–xvi; cf. Arkan, 'Yaya ve Müsellemlerde', pp. 178–9.

88 Cf. Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 242–3; M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *XV–XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı, Vakıflar–Mülkler–Mukataalar* (Istanbul, 1952), p. 14; İnalçık, *Hicri 835 Tarihli*, pp. xv–xvi; Doğru, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Yaya*, pp. 44–5.

From the end of the fourteenth century, the central administration began to impose taxes on their hitherto free land grants, which made it more and more difficult for the *yayas* to fulfil their military duties. Upon the advice of a chief councillor, the pretender Mustafa completely reshuffled them in 1421, and the legitimate rulers subsequently adopted the system he had introduced. He created units of three to five men (*ocak*) from the *yayas* on a parcel of land. These men alternated annually in rendering military service, known as *eşkünci*. The remaining *yayas* on the land (*yamak*, ‘assistant’) paid 50 *akçe* per person to cover the expenses of those serving. In exchange, these *yayas* were exempted from extraordinary taxes, and their tithes and other levies were used to provide for the organisation and the officers. In 1421 the Rumelian *yayas* were converted into mounted soldiers, with the exception of those in Gelibolu (Gallipoli), and called *müsellem*. Either at the same time or shortly afterwards, *müsellem* units were also set up in Anatolia and served in the same way as the *yayas*.⁸⁹ Presumably around this time separate *yaya* and *müsellem sancaks* were created with a *subaşı* holding the rank of *sancakbeyi* heading each district. The *sancaks* were divided into *nahiyes* under the *yayabaşıs* for the footmen and the *çeribaşıs* for the mounted units.⁹⁰ These commanders, like the *beys*, received *timar*-holdings as remuneration. With the passage of time, an upper stratum evolved, especially in Rumeli, from the *eşküncis* and their replacement (the *çatals* or *müşterek*s) within the *yaya* and *müsellem ocaks* until they eventually monopolised military service.⁹¹

Until the late 1440s the archer *yaya* infantry was one of the centrally important military units of the Ottoman army, heading the defensive system around the sultan together with the *azabs*. Towards the middle of the century, however, both they and the *müsellems* were gradually degraded to auxiliary ranks. The new duties of the latter included the clearing of the roads, while the *yayas* were put in charge of transporting guns and ammunition.⁹²

Yürüks and Tatars

In order to consolidate its conquests, the Ottoman state settled nomadic Turks (*yürüks*) in the Balkans in large numbers. In addition to this, there was also voluntary mass migration from western Anatolia into these territories. As a result, heavy *yürük* concentrations developed in Macedonia, Thessaly, Thrace

89 The most important evidence concerning the reorganisation is supplied by Azamat, *Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, p. 61; cf. Fodor, ‘The Way of a Seljuq Institution’, 376 and nn. 37–8; see further Arkan, ‘Yaya ve Müsellemelerde’, pp. 176–93.

90 Doğru, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Yaya*, pp. 38–9.

91 Arkan, ‘Yaya ve Müsellemelerde’, pp. 188–9.

92 Tursun Bey, *Târih-i Ebü’l-Feth*, pp. 47–8.

and Bulgaria.⁹³ This large manpower resource was used by the government partly as reserve, partly as the pool from which to recruit a special military unit. Although no contemporaneous data are extant it seems obvious that the *yürüks*, just like the *yayas*, were organised in *ocaks* and performed service in return for tax exemption. However, their units were probably more heavily manned and stratified, since the person whose turn it was to go to war and his three replacements (*çatal*) were supported by twenty *yamaks* in the second half of the fifteenth century.⁹⁴ Their commanders were *timar*-holding *subaşı*s with the rank of *sancakbeyi*, below whom were the *çeribaşı*s, as was the case for the *müsellems*. In the Balkans, the *yürüks* took over the role of the *yayas* turned *müsellems* and fought armed with a coat of mail, lance, shield, sword and bow.

In the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries, a few Tatar groups also settled in the Balkan peninsula, first mainly around Edirne. Later, they are found concentrated in four districts, mainly along the military routes where they lived mixed with the *yürüks*, and rendered service within the latter's military structure.⁹⁵

Cerehors

In the Anatolian Seljuk armies of the thirteenth century there was a unit called *jira-khvar*.⁹⁶ This was a general term designating hired soldiers of various ethnic origins who were mainly recruited in times of emergency. After the Ottomans had conquered the old Seljuk territories in central Anatolia, they adopted the method of mobilising volunteers in return for wages. These irregularly enlisted warriors, who included both Muslims and Christians, were called *cerehor* in Ottoman-Turkish, or sometimes *serehor/sarahor*. They were armed with a sword, shield and lance, and some also had armour. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, the *cerehor* service gradually lost its voluntary character. The government transformed it into an irregular levy imposed on the tax-paying population and integrated it into the system of extraordinary war taxes. Under this system, each four or five households had to supply a man (*cerehor*) fit for

93 Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler*, pp. 1–85, 90–251; Werner, *Die Geburt*, pp. 207–10; Halil İnalçık, 'The Yürüks: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role', in *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies II: Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400–1600*, ed. Robert Pinner and Walter B. Denny (London, 1986), pp. 39–65; Mehmet İnbaşı, *Rumeli Yörükleri (1544–1675)* (Erzurum, 2000).

94 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV ve XVI ıncı Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları. Kanunlar* (Istanbul, 1943), p. 393.

95 Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler*, pp. 86–90; İnalçık and Oğuz, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd*, pp. 83–4 n. 6; İnbaşı, *Rumeli Yörükleri*, pp. 96–109.

96 Bombaci, 'The Army of the Saljuqs of Rûm', 353–7.

war and had to provide for all his expenses and supplies. The mobilisation of the *cerehors* was often associated with the proclamation of a general call to arms (*nefir-i am*) resorted to in critical situations. The *cerehors*, whose number occasionally amounted to about 10,000, generally fought on the left wing of the army, and the majority of them went to war on horseback. By the second half of the fifteenth century, the *cerehors* had lost their combatant role, and had been relegated to act as sappers.⁹⁷

Voynuks, Vlachs and *martoloses*

The *vojnici* or *vojini* belonged to the lesser nobility of the Balkan Slav states and possessed hereditary estates (*baština*). Tradition maintains that the Ottomans incorporated them into their own military under the name *voynuk* in the 1370s.⁹⁸ It is not known how this took place, but in the early 1430s the *voynuk* army demonstrably mirrored the *yaya* troops with the difference that the basic unit consisting of a mounted or foot *voynuk* and two to three assistants (*yamak*) was here called *gönder*. The *voynuk* and his assistants had *baştinas* exempted from taxes. The replacement was ensured by the family and the relatives who were registered as official reserves (*zevaîd*) and rewarded with considerable tax allowances. Most of the Bulgarian *voynuks* were ordered to serve the sultan's stable.⁹⁹ The *voynuk* organisation was also extended to (or, what is equally feasible, borrowed from) the Vlachs (*Eflak*), a populous group of shepherds and peasants with special legal status (*ius walachicum*) living in large numbers in the Balkans.¹⁰⁰ They rendered *voynuk* service and tended to their lands in return for extremely favourable lump sum taxes (*adet-i eflakiye*). Their commanders – the *lagator*, the most junior, followed by the *primikür*, the *çeribaşı* and, at the top of the hierarchy, the *voynuk* district governor who co-ordinated the geographically widely scattered *voynuks* – either had free *baştinas* or belonged to the *sipahi* class as *timar*-holders. Although they were found everywhere, they lived in large numbers along the strategic routes and in the border zones, playing a key role in warding off enemy raids and guarding the castles and towns.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Fodor, 'The Way of a Seljuq Institution', 367–83.

⁹⁸ Saadeddin, *Tâcü't-tevârih*, I, p. 94.

⁹⁹ İnalçık, *Fatih Devri*, pp. 137–77; Zirojević, *Tursko vojno uređenje*, pp. 162–9; Werner, *Die Geburt*, pp. 210–17; Yavuz Ercan, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bulgarlar ve Voynuklar* (Ankara, 1986).

¹⁰⁰ For their origins and spread, see Gottfried Schramm, *Ein Damm bricht. Die römische Donaugrenze und die Invasionen des 5.–7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern* (Munich, 1997); cf. T. J. Winnifrith, *The Vlachs: the History of a Balkan People* (London, 1995); Hegyi, 'Magyar és balkáni katonaparasztok', pp. 1267–72.

¹⁰¹ Nicoară Beldiceanu, 'La région de Timok–Morava dans les documents de Mehmed II et de Selim I,' *Revue des Études Roumaines* 3–4 (1957), 111–29; Nicoară Beldiceanu, 'Les

The organisation of the *martoloses* (from the Greek *armatolos*, 'armed men') also derives from pre-Ottoman times, and they are thought to have been incorporated into the Ottoman military around 1421. Initially, they served mainly along the European borders of the empire, partly on foot and partly on horseback. The Ottomans used them to man fortresses and river fleets, to guard riversides, carry out raids, reconnoitre and take prisoners as well as for various policing activities. At first, they and their families were exempted from paying several taxes and many of them also received regular pay and a share of the booty.¹⁰²

The majority of the listed contingents had some basic features in common. Their members fought in return for tax exemption (mostly from extraordinary war taxes) or tax allowances, or, in other words, they fulfilled their obligation to pay war tax by doing military service and/or raising the costs of the conscripts. Collective military service may have been the outcome of autochthonous development as in the Frankish empire where in the 800s the impoverished freemen did not go to war individually but two to five men jointly equipped and supplied a warrior (see also the German *agrarii milites* in the 900s).¹⁰³ Since, however, the earliest element of the system (*voynuk*) and several terms (such as *lagator*, *primikür* and *gönder*) are of pre-Ottoman origin, it cannot be precluded that we are faced with the Ottomanised form of the late Byzantine smallholding system.¹⁰⁴ Among those who served under the *ocak* system, service was usually passed down from father to son, and the state itself was intent on making them into an increasingly closed group. To this end, they were gradually elevated to the military (*askeri*) class, even though most of them still lived a peasant way of life. Consequently, the majority of the Ottoman peasant soldiers could be subsumed under the regular standing army. Through these agencies, broad masses of not only the conquerors but also the subjugated were involved in

Valaques de Bosnie à la fin du XVe siècle et leurs institutions', *Turcica* 7 (1975), 122–34; Nicoară Beldiceanu, 'Les Roumains à la bataille d'Ankara', *Südost-Forschungen* 14, 2 (1955), 441–50; Nicoară Beldiceanu and Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'Quatre actes de Mehmed II concernant les Valaques des Balkans slaves', *Südost-Forschungen* 24 (1955), 103–18; Werner, *Die Geburt*, pp. 210–17.

102 Milan Vasić, 'Die Martolosen im Osmanischen Reich', *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 2 (1964), 172–89; Milan Vasić, *Martolosi u jugoslovenskim zemljama pod turskom vladavinom* (Sarajevo, 1967); İnalçık, *Fatih Devri*, pp. 179–80; Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Derbend Teşkilâtı*, 2nd edn (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 85–96; Hegyi, 'Magyar és balkáni katonaparasztok', pp. 1266–7, 1270–1.

103 Eugen von Frauenholz, *Das Heerwesen der germanischen Frühzeit, des Frankenreiches und des ritterlichen Zeitalters (Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Heerwesens)*, vol. I (Munich, 1935), pp. 159–61, 177–80; E. Sander, 'Die Heeresorganisation Heinrichs I', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1939), 1–26.

104 For this, see Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, pp. 157–90.

and benefited from the wars of conquest. This ‘socialisation’ of the war was one of the main guarantees of the dynamism and efficiency of the Ottoman military organisation in that period.

Vassals

From the second half of the fourteenth century the vassal states were expected regularly to send contingents of varying size to fight on the side of the Ottomans. Between 1379 and 1400 Manuel II (Byzantine co-emperor from 1373 and emperor from 1391) and his army had to accompany Murad I and Bayezid I on their campaigns almost every year.¹⁰⁵ The same fate befell the Serbian princes after the battle of Kosovo (1389). During the 1430s the Serbian despot of Smederevo had to send a force of 800 to 3,000 men commanded by one of his sons to assist the Ottoman army.¹⁰⁶ The vassal troops often provided invaluable help to the Ottomans as exemplified by the battles at Nikopolis and Ankara. In the first case, it was the charge of the Serbian cavalry of Stefan Lazarević that decided the outcome of the battle; and in the second, it was his 5,000 cavalry lancers covered in ‘black armour’ who stood fast by the sultan and were the last to flee from the battlefield.¹⁰⁷

Armament: the diffusion and use of firearms

Mention having been made of the arms and equipment of the Ottomans in the discussion of individual army units, only a few general characteristics will be emphasised here. Contemporary foreign observers usually stressed two aspects. First, that the armament of a considerable segment of the army appeared very simple, and was often regarded as poor. Bertrandon de la Broquière, for example, had a low opinion of the quality of the weapons in 1433.¹⁰⁸ Second, the arms of even the best-equipped mounted troops (especially their armour) were much lighter than the enemy’s, and the resulting agility and manoeuvring ability ensured them enormous advantages in field battles.¹⁰⁹ The armament was lighter because the smaller Turkish horses could carry less weight. It was, nevertheless, the excellent horses that were one of the main assets of the Ottoman cavalry, as they were less demanding, more enduring

105 George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford, 1968; repr. 1980), pp. 543, 548–9.

106 Ostrogorsky, *History*, p. 547; Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 185, 209.

107 Imber, *The Ottoman Empire*, p. 46; Doukas, *Decline and Fall*, p. 93; Jorga, *Geschichte*, 1, pp. 321, 331.

108 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 202, 221, 224, 227.

109 Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 171.

and faster than the European mounts.¹¹⁰ Since the Christian cuirasses withstood the sword, the weaponry of the Ottoman infantry also contained various thrusting and cutting tools such as the war-axe, the halberd and especially the pick-axe (*külünk*) that were capable of breaking through the heavy armour.¹¹¹ While lighter weaponry was advantageous in field battles, its disadvantages became apparent in sieges, as the soldiers were far more vulnerable while climbing the fortress walls, more exposed to the arrows and bullets showering on them than were the plate-armoured defenders of a fortress.

It was during their conquest in the Balkans (in the 1380s) that the Ottomans became acquainted with gunpowder technology and guns and began to adopt and integrate them into their own warfare. In this process, a major role was played by the Balkan vassal subjects as well as the western experts who, entering Ottoman service, initially transmitted and later further developed the then up-to-date knowledge. As a result, within the next half a century the Ottomans became a real 'gunpowder empire' ahead of their rivals in many regards.¹¹²

There is evidence at our disposal showing that the Ottomans first used firearms during the repeated sieges of Constantinople (1394–1402, 1422).¹¹³ While these cannons (actually large bombards) proved rather ineffective, those used at the siege of Thessalonike (1430) were far more successful. Cannons had become the fundamental and indispensable weapons of the Ottoman army by the 1440s. Based on experiences gained in the series of battles with the Hungarians, the Ottomans created their field artillery and used it with success as early as the battle of Kosovo in 1448.¹¹⁴ It was apparently also from the Hungarians that they learnt the *Wagenburg*-tactic (*tabur cengi*) of Hussite origin, though they rarely resorted to it prior to 1453. This was a sort of fortification created from hundreds of carts chained together by their wheels and packed with crossbowmen, hand-gunners and light artillery.¹¹⁵ In 1444 the Ottoman

110 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 218, 221, 229; on the Turkoman horse, see Mehmet Altay Köymen, 'Alp Arslan Zamanı Selçuklu Askerî Teşkilâtı', *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5 (1967), 53–72.

111 İnalcık and Oğuz, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd*, pp. 21, 53, 55, 62.

112 For a general assessment, see Jeremy Black, *War and the World: Military Power and the Fate of Continents 1450–2000* (New Haven and London, 2000), particularly pp. 20–1; Gábor Ágoston, 'Ottoman Warfare in Europe 1453–1826', in *European Warfare 1453–1815*, ed. Jeremy Black (London, 1999), pp. 123–5; Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, pp. 17, 42–8, 56–60.

113 Djurdjica Petrović, 'Fire-arms in the Balkans on the Eve of and After the Ottoman Conquests of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V. J. Parry and M. E. Yapp (London, 1975), pp. 174–8, 190–1.

114 Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, pp. 17–18.

115 Emanuel Constantin Antoché, 'Du *tábor* de Jan Žižka et de Jean Hunyadi au *tabur cengi* des armées ottomanes. L'art militaire hussite en Europe orientale, au Proche et au Moyen Orient (XVe–XVIIe siècles)', *Turcica* 36 (2004), 91–124.

artillery was already capable of firing at enemy ships, that is, moving targets, to cover the troops crossing at the Bosphorus. During Murad II's reign shipboard artillery also appeared.¹¹⁶

The largest part of Ottoman artillery in this period comprised wrought-iron monster guns. They were huge hard-to-transport bombards that could shoot stone balls of several hundred kilograms each. By the mid-fifteenth century the Ottomans had learnt to cast bronze guns that included smaller calibre pieces too. For lack of permanent foundries, they usually cast the guns on the spot using materials brought with them. The situation gradually changed towards the middle of the century, especially when they began to prepare for the siege of Constantinople. For this major undertaking (1453), they deployed one of the world's most advanced artilleries with a variety of guns: giant bombards including a monster gun of unprecedented size cast by Master Orban of Hungary; mortars or heavy short-barrelled guns that threw the stone balls or explosive shells with parabolic trajectories, used now for the first time against the Byzantine ships; and small-calibre cannons, similar to the most advanced French artillery,¹¹⁷ which they deployed in mixed batteries (fourteen in number). With these mobile units, they carried out one of the first mass bombardments in history.¹¹⁸

We have enough reason to suppose that parallel with, or in the wake of, the field-pieces, hand-held firearms also appeared in the Ottoman army. As noted above, a small number of the janissaries probably carried hand guns (*tüfek*, *tüfenk*) during the 1440s. In the middle of the century, the existence can be attested to in some Balkan fortresses of gunner units (*tüfenkçi*), many of whom were Christian subjects of the sultan. The guns may well have been imported from abroad and in part acquired during the skirmishes. However, these weapons, which were probably matchlock arquebuses, were not used widely until the later part of the fifteenth century.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ İnalçık and Oğuz, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd*, pp. 47–8; Ağoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, p. 18.

¹¹⁷ Bert S. Hall, *Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics* (Baltimore and London, 1997), p. 130.

¹¹⁸ John Norris, *Early Gunpowder Artillery c.1300–1600* (Ramsbury, 2003), pp. 108–11; Feridun M. Emecen, *İstanbul'un Fethi Olayı ve Meseleleri* (Istanbul, 2003), pp. 18, 37; Ağoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, pp. 61–8.

¹¹⁹ Ağoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, pp. 19, 88. The question remains whether the more expensive Ottoman arms and armours were in the main domestic or imported products in the period at issue. While there is ample evidence showing that Italian trading cities exported large quantities of arms and armours into the Levant during the thirteenth and early fourteenth century, such evidence verifying the supposed Genoese and Venetian arms trade into the Ottoman Empire during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century is still lacking. Cf. Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 112–21. It is worth noting,

Supply and transport

Very little information survives about the provisions of the army and the transportation of ammunition. It is highly probable that, in a similar way to later practices, a well-organised camp folk accompanied the sultan's army including a whole range of craftsmen from food merchants to blacksmiths.¹²⁰ A considerable proportion of the food, fodder and ammunition was delivered by subjects in exchange for tax exemption or as extraordinary war tax (*avarız-i divani*) introduced in the latter half of the fourteenth century.¹²¹ At the same time, producers were also expected to sell their surplus produce to the soldiers at fixed prices.¹²² A part of the timariot army was supplied by the equipment (kitchen, saddlery) brought along by the officers. The court troops were provided for by the central treasury.

In most of the period under discussion the Ottomans hardly, if at all, used carts for transportation. Towards the mid-fifteenth century, however, the big siege-guns would be forwarded to their destination on wagons drawn by oxen. The main transporting vehicles were the camel, the mule and the draught horse; they were provided partly by the common subjects and the dignitaries, and partly loaned by merchants. The sultan's treasury, the military band, the food and arms of the court troops were loaded on the many hundred camels and mules of the ruler's stable.¹²³ The camels were used to barricade the camp or the centre and to disorganise the lines of the enemy (see below). In the latter case, they were employed with caution because the frightened animals could easily become uncontrollable.¹²⁴

The conduct of war

Field battles

By the end of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans had developed a special Ottoman *manière de combattre* based on the co-operation of the light-armoured cavalry using the traditional nomadic tactic, and the infantry whose discipline

however, that in a list of armaments of the Ottoman court salaried troops marching to Hungary (the Mohács campaign) in 1526, more than 40 per cent of the various armours were of European origins; Feridun M. Emecen, 'A csata, amely a "Nagy Török" előtt megnyitotta a Magyar Alföldet', in *Mohács*, ed. János B. Szabó (Budapest, 2006), p. 428.

120 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, 1, pp. 258–9; Iacopo de Promontorio, *Die Aufzeichnungen*, pp. 45–6.

121 Fodor, 'The Way of a Seljuq Institution', 374–8.

122 Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 189.

123 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, p. 186; Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 163.

124 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, 1, pp. 278–85.

was unparalleled in the age.¹²⁵ This battle array was aimed primarily at guaranteeing the personal safety of the sultan, hence it was basically defensive.¹²⁶ The ruler was always situated in the centre, in front of the camp, flanked on the right and left by his court cavalry, clad partly in heavy armour. In front of him were the janissaries, the *yayas* and the *azabs* arranged in several 'layers' (*kat*), of which there were seven at the battle of Varna for example, to make their ranks impenetrable. When field artillery appeared, the guns were placed here, before the janissaries and behind the *azabs*. An entrenchment was created (first attested to as early as in 1396) around the centre crowned by a line of densely placed wooden stakes and pavises, the janissaries shooting their arrows, and later their bullets, from behind this blindage. In the second battle of Kosovo in 1448 they fortified the entrenchment with wagons (*Wagenburg*). The *sipahi* cavalry of the two provinces and the *akıncı* troops were lined up on the right and left wings, reinforced sometimes with foot *azabs* and militiamen as well as *cerehors*.

The battle process was usually as follows. With feigned attacks and retreats the *sipahi* cavalry disrupted the mounted troops of the enemy, also disturbed by the incessant shooting of arrows and by burning camels, and led them towards the Ottoman infantry. When the attackers reached the latter's ranks, they parted suddenly to give way, then closed behind them. The Ottoman foot soldiers then systematically killed the enemy horses with their thrusting and cutting weapons, and annihilated the immobilised soldiers in close combat. Those who were not thus trapped were encircled and destroyed by the returning cavalry that had in the meantime restored its order. In the 1440s, the Christian soldiers surviving the massacre usually retreated into their camp, strengthened with a wagon fortress. The Ottoman infantry either made an assault on it, or, if it was equipped with superior firepower, encircled it and forced those inside to surrender by starving them out.

125 For the nomadic heritage, see Peter B. Golden, 'War and Warfare in the Pre-Çinggisid Western Steppes of Eurasia', in *Warfare in Inner Asian History, 500–1800*, ed. Nicola Di Cosmo (Leiden, 2002), pp. 105–72.

126 The following is in the main based on Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 216–31; İnalçık and Oğuz, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd*, pp. 12–69; Enveri, *Fatih Devri Kaynaklarından Düstûrnâme*, pp. 31–3; Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 165–9; cf. V. J. Parry, 'La manière de combattre', in Parry and Yapp, *War, Technology and Society*, pp. 218–21; Stephen Christensen, 'The Heathen Order of Battle', in *Violence and the Absolutist State: Studies in European and Ottoman History*, ed. Stephen Christensen (Copenhagen, 1990), pp. 75–132; Emanuel Constantin Antoche, 'Les expéditions de Nicopolis (1396) et de Varna (1444): une comparaison', *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 4, 1–2 (2000), 28–74; Tamás Pálosfalvi, *Nikápolytól Mohácsig 1396–1526* (Budapest, 2005), particularly pp. 48, 54, 94, 103, 105.

The Ottoman army owed its successive victories first of all to the infantry and the court troops, as well as to good co-operation between various units. Communication was ensured by the sophisticated military music and the corp of the *çavuşes* who rapidly forwarded the sultan's orders to the different companies. The most prominent commanders of enemy armies and observers such as the Hungarian Michael Szilágyi and Georgius de Hungaria recognised the decisive role of the infantry and the court troops.¹²⁷ However, as long as their opponents insisted on a battle tactic based primarily on the attacks of the heavy (in the west) or the light (in the east) cavalry and were short of an efficient infantry, they usually left the battlefields defeated.¹²⁸

Siege warfare

In the latter half of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans made great progress not only in field battles but also in formal siege warfare, adopting all its most up-to-date elements. At the turn of the century they used various siege engines (mangonels and siege towers) and mantelets, and within a decade or two, and certainly by 1422, they had learnt the use of mining to weaken the walls and protect the besiegers.¹²⁹ Cannons were also used for the first time around this date, growing in significance from the 1440s in the assaults on fortresses. In the siege of Constantinople in 1453 nearly all these elements were present, including multi-level siege towers, but it was the cannons and mines which proved to be the most efficient weapons.¹³⁰

In the first phase of a siege the besiegers encircled the fortress, dug trenches and shot holes in the walls with the siege engines and field-pieces. Having caused enough damage to the fortifications, the troops were commanded via criers to launch a general assault. On the eve of the attack – as we read in the evocative description of Konstantin Mihajlović –

127 Georgius de Hungaria, 'Incipit', p. 74.

128 The need for an effective infantry was also felt by the Ilkhanids of Persia, but they failed 'to field a force of heavy cavalry and supporting infantry that was at least equal in size to that of the Mamluks'; A. P. Martinez, 'Some Notes on the Īl-Xānid Army', *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 6 (1985 [1987]), 179.

129 Imber, *The Structure of Power*, pp. 254–5. As Kantakouzenos mentions briefly in his chronicle (*Geschichte*, II. p. 89) the forces of Orhan used siege engines at Nicomedia (İzmit) as early as in 1333.

130 Hüseyin Dağtekin, 'İstanbul'un Fethinde Kullanılan Yürütkuleler', in *Fetihten Önce, Fetihten Sonra* (İstanbul, 2003), pp. 45–65; Emecen, *İstanbul'un Fethi Olayı*, p. 14; on later developments, see Christopher Duffy, *Siege Warfare: the Fortress in the Early Modern World 1494–1660* (London and New York, 1979), esp. pp. 191–219.

lighted tallow candles [are] raised profusely throughout the army so that it looks as if the stars are shining . . . above the clouds¹³¹ . . . And at night they go toward the city from all sides silently, slowing approaching the fosse, carrying before them barricades woven of branches and also strongly-built ladders so that they can climb up and down both sides of the ladder. The Janissaries then in this fashion go to the place where the wall is breached and having approached the breached place, they wait until day begins to appear. Then first the gunners fire from all the cannon . . . [and after that] the Janissaries quickly scale the wall, for at this moment the Christians are retreating before the cannon, and when they see that the Janissaries are on the walls, having turned about suddenly, they begin to fight bravely on both sides. And here the Janissaries, urging one another, climb up. And in addition the shot from bows comes very thick, for they continually bring and replenish their shot, and besides [there is] a great tumult from drums and human outcry. Thus the battle lasts an hour or at most two.¹³²

This piece of information sheds light on the crucial role of the janissaries once again: while they played a basically defensive role in field battles, they also constituted the most efficient offensive formation of the Ottoman army in siege warfare. It is hardly accidental that the defences were first broken through by janissary units during the siege of Constantinople.

Naval and river fleets

For an empire possessing large dominions in both Asia Minor and Europe it was essential to secure the continuity of communication and transfer of forces between the two continents. This could not be achieved without effective control of the Straits, a task which, in turn, could not be fulfilled without a naval fleet, especially as long as Byzantium existed in the heart of the empire.¹³³

However, lacking any seafaring experience, the Ottomans were forced to turn for help to various Turkish forces who practised piracy on the Aegean. A Venetian report suggests that they had a smaller fleet of their own as early as 1374.¹³⁴ After the conquest of the maritime principalities of Aydın and Menteşe several skilled men and experts came into Ottoman service, giving a great impetus to the development of the navy. The Ottomans also used and

¹³¹ On this practice, see also Emecen, *İstanbul'un Fethi Olayı*, p. 24, 92–3.

¹³² Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, pp. 186–7.

¹³³ Kate Fleet, 'Early Turkish Naval Activities', in *The Ottomans and the Sea*, ed. Kate Fleet, *Oriente Moderno* 20 (81), 1 (2001), 129–38; Colin Imber, 'Before the Kapudan Pasha: Sea Power and the Emergence of the Ottoman Empire', in *Kapudan Pasha: his Office and his Domain*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 2002), pp. 49–59.

¹³⁴ Fleet, 'Early Turkish Naval Activities', p. 133.

integrated Byzantino-Greek traditions and manpower, just as they were ready to learn from, and accept the help of, the Latins, especially the Genoese, in the Levant. It was the Genoese who undertook several times to ship the Ottoman troops across the sea. In shipbuilding and dockyard technology, they were most strongly influenced by the Venetians.¹³⁵ This openness and multi-directional acculturation is reflected by the Ottoman nautical vocabulary which abounds in Greek and Latin/Italian words.

During Bayezid I's reign, the Ottoman fleet had a mere seventeen vessels, whereas around 1402 a traveller reported forty to sixty ships. The first marine base and main crossing point of the Ottomans was Gelibolu (Gallipoli), earlier the centre of the Byzantine fleet. The Byzantine historiographer Doukas recorded that Sultan Bayezid had it considerably rebuilt and fortified with towers to make it suitable for shipbuilding and the accommodation of large galleys, and to enable its naval forces to control the commercial traffic through the Straits and to levy duties on it. The harbour consisted of an outer and an inner pool separated by a bridge fortified by a three-storey tower. The mouth of the harbour was closed by a chain in case of necessity. By 1422, further fortifications (walls and towers) had been built, necessitated by the enemy attacks of the previous years.

The Gelibolu base had irritated the Venetians from the beginning, since they were worried that the strengthening Ottoman naval forces would threaten the freedom of their trade. The first open sea battle between the two powers took place on 29 May 1416, after the Ottoman fleet, consisting of thirty vessels and led by Admiral Çalı, had plundered the Venetian islands. The Venetians scored a crushing victory, seizing twelve, fourteen or twenty-seven ships, according to different sources. In the course of the Venetian–Ottoman war of 1423–30 the Venetians broke into the inner harbour of Gelibolu but in the end failed to keep the docks.¹³⁶

By the middle of the century the size of the Ottoman fleet, which consisted mainly of oared galleys with single masts and lateen sails (*kadırga*), had increased considerably. According to a Venetian eye-witness account, the Ottoman fleet blockading Constantinople in 1453 comprised 145 ships: 12 galleys, 70 to 80 large galiots (*fusta/kalyata*), 20 to 25 *parandaria* and other ships, including pirate vessels.¹³⁷ In addition to the warships, the Ottomans probably from an early date used larger ships for transporting men, horses, ammunition

¹³⁵ İdris Bostan, *Kürekli ve Yelkenli Osmanlı Gemileri* (Istanbul, 2005), p. 25.

¹³⁶ Halil İnalcık, 'Gelibolu', in *El2*, II, p. 984.

¹³⁷ Fleet, 'Early Turkish Naval Activities', p. 134.

and, later, ordnance.¹³⁸ The fleet admiral's post was probably filled by the district governor of Gelibolu, although the first evidence to verify this assumption dates from 1453.¹³⁹

The Ottoman fleet was for a long period deployed around the Straits, its activity being restricted to covering the crossings, as well as attacking enemy ships and shores. In the late 1420s, it ventured into the Aegean and, in support of the land troops, took part in combined attacks, for example in the sieges of Thessalonike (1430) and Constantinople (1453). The role of the navy in both cases was to complete the blockade of the city on the side facing the sea and deprive the defenders of the possibility of obtaining external help. Although it was a great step forward, the Ottoman warships were still far from standing their ground in an open formal battle with the more heavily built, better-equipped western fleets. The fact, however, that apart from the Venetians and the Knights Hospitaller of Rhodes, only the Ottomans had a regular navy, considerably increased the political weight of their state.¹⁴⁰

When the Ottomans reached the Danube and encountered the Hungarian ships laden with artillery, they quickly recognised the importance of river fleets. Apparently, they already had river forces on the Danube and on the Morava in Serbia during Murad II's reign. Hungarian sources inform us that when King Sigismund laid siege to the fortress of Galambóc (Golubac, Güğercinlik) on the Danube in 1428, the Ottomans tried unsuccessfully to break through the Hungarian blockade with ships sent up the Morava.¹⁴¹ In 1433, Bertrandon de la Broquière noted that the sultan kept eighty to a hundred *fustas* (galiots, small oared warships) at the confluence of the Serbian rivers, the western and southern Morava, for the crossing of horses and troops, and that the ships were guarded by 300 men, replaced every two months. He found another hundred *fustas* at Galambóc, also used to transport soldiers across to Hungary.¹⁴² It has been suggested that the Ottomans may have used some sort of ordnance aboard these ships because their Hungarian counterparts were also equipped with small cannons.¹⁴³ On the basis of this information and these suggestions, it can be concluded that river flotillas must have been employed for the transport

138 For the Ottoman types of ships, see Bostan, *Osmanlı Bahriye*, pp. 83–97; Bostan, *Kürekli ve Yelkenli*, pp. 169–281.

139 Cf. Elizabeth Zachariadou, 'Notes on the *Subaşı*s and the Early *Sancakbeyis* of Gelibolu', in Zachariadou, *Kapudan Pasha*, pp. 61–3.

140 Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, p. 49. 141 Pálosfalvi, *Nikápolytól Mohácsig*, p. 62.

142 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 207, 215; cf. Colin Heywood, 'Notes on the Production of Fifteenth-Century Ottoman Cannon', in Colin Heywood, *Writing Ottoman History: Documents and Interpretations* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 8–9.

143 Ágoston, *Guns for the Sultan*, p. 18.

of troops and animals as well as for the siege of riverside fortresses in a variety of ways: taking troops to the shore, blockading a fortress and shooting at the fortress wall from the cannons aboard.

Concluding remarks

During a century and a half, the Ottomans developed one of the best war machines of the age. This was due to a variety of factors.¹⁴⁴ The first was their possession of a large standing army before their enemies started to create similar forces; the composition of this army was well balanced and could be mobilised and deployed with an unparalleled rapidity. Second, they had a numerical superiority and an abundance of manpower supply which enabled them to replace their losses in a short time. Third, they benefited from having plenty of raw materials and victuals which allowed them to provide the army with armament and provisions relatively easily. Fourth, they had the necessary ability and readiness to accommodate foreign technologies and experts and to take an active part in the international trade and transfer of knowledge and weapons. Based on these factors, they developed tactical elements which, being far ahead of the age, eventually ensured the Ottomans repeated victories.

¹⁴⁴ On some of these, see Virginia Aksan, 'Ottoman War and Warfare 1453–1812', in Black, *War and the World*, pp. 147–75; Ágoston, 'Ottoman Warfare'; Gábor Ágoston, "'The Most Powerful Empire": Ottoman Flexibility and Military Might', in *Empires and Superpowers: Their Rise and Fall*, ed. George Zimmar and David Hicks (Washington, DC, 2005), pp. 127–66.

The Turkish economy, 1071–1453

KATE FLEET

It has been an often accepted axiom that Turks and economy were not good bedfellows. Presaged by the clouds of an army on the march, the arrival of the Turk was synonymous with economic disaster. For many historians of the nineteenth century, the imprint of the Turkish horse left eternal destruction and economic ruin. Even if modified and toned down in the later twentieth century, this view of the Turk as an economically destructive presence has, like the Turk's horse, left its mark on thinking about the Ottomans and has coloured much scholarship on the empire.

While later historians regarded the Turks as lacking economic motivation or acumen, contemporary Byzantines did not. Indeed, for Doukas, a well-informed observer of the Turks who knew Turkish and who worked for the Genoese, first in New Phokaea and then in Lesbos, the Turkish 'nation' was 'a lover of money'.¹ Writing much earlier, Kinnamos, too, noted the Turks' concern with financial matters, commenting that nothing distressed them more than economic loss.² The Genoese, those quintessential merchants and entrepreneurs, likewise viewed the Ottomans not as mere military men but as economic partners. It was to money and his constant use of it that the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II owed his ascendancy in the estimation of the Genoese merchant Iacopo de Promontorio, active for many years in Ottoman territory during the reigns of both Mehmed and his father Murad II.³

Putting to one side, therefore, the concept of the economically destructive Turk, one can proceed to consider the economy of the period 1071 to 1453, from the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) which removed effective Byzantine

1 Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, tr. and ed. H. J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1975), pp. 224–5.

2 Kinnamos, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, tr. Charles M. Brand (New York, 1976), p. 148.

3 Iacopo de Promontorio, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis über den Osmanenstaat um 1475*, ed. Franz Babinger (München, 1957), p. 84.

ability to stem the flow of the Turks into Anatolia, to the fall of the Byzantine capital to Mehmed II and the end of the Byzantine Empire, and ask what kind of economy it was and whether there was what might be termed a Turkish economic approach.⁴ Before doing so, however, one needs to acknowledge two major problems: sources and the considerable length of the period examined.

Any in-depth understanding of the early Turkish economy is severely hampered by lack of sources, and the observation of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü that 'the political and social history of the Turks of Anatolia from the eleventh to the fifteenth century has still not been saved from the darkness which covers it' still applies.⁵ There is an almost total absence of Turkish data before 1453. Apart from coins, monuments and inscriptions, only a few Seljuk *vakıfnames* (deeds of trust of pious foundations), the majority of which are Ottoman copies, and a few *tahrirs* (land surveys) for the fifteenth century are extant. There are Persian sources – the works of Ibn Bibi, Eflaki, Aqsara'i and Mustaufi – Arabic sources – in particular al-'Umari and Ibn Battuta for the fourteenth century – and the Greek histories of Choniates, Doukas, Pachymeres, Gregoras, Kinnamos, and Kantakuzenos. To these may be added some travel literature, such as the accounts by Marco Polo and Bertrandon de la Broquière. The majority of the material which has survived and which is particularly relevant for economic history, however, comes from the trading states in the west, in particular the city-states of Genoa and Venice. These data include notary deeds (particularly important for trade between merchants, commodities and locations), merchant letters, commune account books, state discussions over trade relations, and treaties, in essence trade agreements, with Turkish states. Other western material includes the merchant manual of Pegolotti, the account by the Cretan merchant Piloti and the account book of the Venetian merchant Badoer. The inevitable result of this level of Latin material is that the image of economic activity becomes dominated by Turkish–Latin commercial relations. This dominance may in fact represent the reality of the period, but it is essential to bear in mind that this may well not be the case.⁶ Trade relations with the Mamluks, with Iran and the east, and with the northern regions

4 I use Turkish economic approaches here to mean those implemented in Turkish-ruled states.

5 M. Fuad Köprülü, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları I', *Belleten* 27 (1943), 379.

6 Philip Remler has argued, for example, on the basis of his study of the silver coinage of the beyliks of the Ottomans, Eretna and the İsfendiyağulları in the fourteenth century that the western beyliks were dependent on the trade from the east and remained in that economic sphere; P. N. Remler, 'Ottoman, İsfendiyağid, and Eretnid Coinage: a Currency Community in Fourteenth-Century Anatolia', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 25 (1980), 186.

across the Black Sea were clearly significant and their absence from many of the sources does not necessarily reflect their lesser importance in comparison with western trade, but could well be related to the absence of the sources themselves. This absence could be due to either the destruction of data or the absence of such data in the first place. It is certainly the case that Latin merchants employed notaries to record every transaction. This was not the case among Ottoman merchants in later centuries whose transactions were verbal not written, and it would be reasonable to presume that such a practice existed also in the earlier period. That documents such as letters or treaties between Turkish states and their neighbours in the east or south have not survived can easily be accounted for by the general political turmoil of the period in which there was a quick succession of states rising and falling in a region often ravaged by warfare.

Much of the non-Latin material we do have is often difficult to interpret. For example, the figures given by Hamd Allah Mustaufi Qazvini, writing around 1340, for the tribute received from Anatolia by the Mongols present problems and while it has been argued that it is possible to accept the overall totals (3.3 million *dinars* under the Mongols, as opposed to 15 million under the Seljuks), the data in general should be treated with caution.⁷ The same applies to many of the economic data from al-'Umari which are very difficult to interpret. According to al-'Umari all foodstuffs sold in Anatolia for moderate prices because of various factors: the low level of taxation, the abundance of free pasturage, the expansion of commerce and the proximity of the sea.⁸ Ibn Battuta, too, commented on the modest prices in Kastamonu, so low he noted that he had never in any country seen a city where prices were lower.⁹ But as Cahen notes, this, if true, does not necessarily mean prosperity and could be an indication of either wealth or poverty.¹⁰ Currency values are not clear, and nor are those of the weights and measures used. The exact workings of the market remain obscure.

Taking a period of nearly four centuries and attempting to consider it as one is, needless to say, a risky undertaking. Inherent in such an approach is the

7 Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: a General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c.1071–1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams (London, 1968), pp. 334–5. For the difficulty of working with Ilkhanid economic data see Philip Remler, 'New Light on Economic History from Ilkhanid Accounting Manuals', *Studia Iranica* 14, 2 (1985), 157–77.

8 Al-'Umari, 'Notice de l'ouvrage qui a pour titre Masalek alabsar fi memalek alamsar, Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées (ms. arabe 583)', tr. E. Quatremère, in *Notices et extraits des mss. de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, vol. XIII (Paris, 1838), p. 336.

9 Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, ed. and tr. H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1962), p. 461.

10 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 171.

danger of assigning to the period overall patterns and formulae which function for one time-span. What works well for the fourteenth century may well not do so for the twelfth. There clearly were periods in which the economy was much more disrupted than in others and when there was a high level of military activity: Turkoman raiding, crusader activity, Byzantine revolting or Timur's invasion.¹¹ We should not, however, overstate the level of destruction for the region overall. Further, certain periods were more prosperous than others, that from around the mid-twelfth to the mid-thirteenth century being described by the eminent historian of the period, Claude Cahen, for example, as a period of 'exceptional economic development'.¹² There is one distinct advantage to viewing 1071–1453 as one continuum. It breaks down the artificial divisions of time, to which historians are so prone, and allows one to understand the fluidity and continuity of Anatolian existence through the various political shifts and changes that occurred. The transition from Orthodox Byzantium to Islamic Ottoman Empire was a very slow one, involving a fluid process of gradual transformation and adaptation. This was a period characterised more by continuity than by abrupt change and economic processes were thus not necessarily subject to rapid transformation.

The Turks who arrived in Anatolia from the late eleventh century on established an economy which developed, thrived and prospered. Far from bringing economic destruction in their wake, it has been argued that their arrival was beneficial for the economy of the region.¹³ Initially very much a nomad economy, the economy of Anatolia under the Turks developed a strong rural and urban base and an important international trade sector.

The nomad economy

Leaving their homes for the grassy meadows of Anatolia, as the twelfth-century Byzantine historian Choniates put it,¹⁴ the Turkoman nomads moved westward from Central Asia and Iran into the rolling upland pastures of the central Anatolian plateau. Ideal for large-scale ranching, the economic backbone of the obstreperous Byzantine magnates in the tenth century,¹⁵ these lands provided the nomads with both winter and summer pasture for their extensive

11 Doukas describes Timur's progress through western Anatolia when troops moved from city to city 'leaving each in such a state of desolation that not even the bark of a dog nor the cackle of a hen nor the cry of a child was any longer heard'; Doukas, *Decline*, p. 99.

12 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 168. 13 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 156, 163.

14 Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, tr. Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1984), p. 71.

15 Alan Harvey, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 152.

herds and flocks. Crossing this central region, by now largely out of Byzantine control and the preserve only of the latifundia of absentee landlords, the Turkomans spread further westwards and by 1146 had apparently reached the region of the Meander river (Büyük Menderes) where the Byzantine emperor Manuel I came upon them unexpectedly when relaxing in what he thought to be safe territory. Attracted by rustling, the Byzantines were distressed to find Turkoman herds grazing near where they had stopped to rest as they returned from Anatolia to Constantinople.¹⁶ The Turkomans travelled in considerable numbers of families and flocks, setting up large tent encampments, such as that of 2,000 people described by Kinnamos around Dorylaion (Eskişehir) in 1175.¹⁷

The nomad economy of the Turkomans rested on their herds which provided them with their livelihood, supplying their daily needs – food, clothing and tents¹⁸ – and the items with which they traded – meat, dairy products, hides and hair, as well as the raw materials with which they manufactured *kilims* and carpets. The Turkoman herds, as Bertrandon de la Broquière noted, were extremely large.¹⁹ Those in the beylik of Germiyan in western Anatolia were so great that, according to one contemporary, only God could calculate them.²⁰ Of these the most numerous were the sheep ‘for they truly cover the surface of the land’.²¹ Apart from the large, fat, long-tailed sheep, the delicacy of whose fat and the exquisite flavour of whose meat excited the praise of the Egyptian al-‘Umari in the 1330s, the nomad herds included horses, camels, mules, asses – whose heads and hooves, ears and hair were like those of stags – and long, soft, curly-haired goats, the most beautiful Bertrandon de la Broquière had ever seen, whose skin was as fine as silk.²² Buffalo were used to carry the Turkomans’ merchandise.

One of the most valuable livestock assets of the Turkomans was the horse. The central Anatolia plateau was ideally suited to horse breeding. It was here that most of the Byzantine imperial stud farms had been located and loss of this region to the Turks may have disrupted supplies of horses for the Byzantine army.²³ Turkoman horses were highly regarded and fetched high prices,

16 Kinnamos, *Deeds*, p. 54. 17 Kinnamos, *Deeds*, p. 220.

18 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d’Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière*, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892) pp. 89, 92, described the tents as the most beautiful you could see, made of white cotton cloth and blue felt. Each tent, which was round, could house fifteen or sixteen people, and contained all the people’s needs.

19 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, p. 85; al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, pp. 334, 355; Ansbertus, *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. Josepho Dobrowsky (Prague, 1827), p. 85.

20 Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 355. 21 Al-‘Umari, *Voyages*, p. 335.

22 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 85–6; al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, pp. 335–6.

23 Harvey, *Economic Expansion*, p. 152.

Marco Polo commenting on this and on the excellence of a breed of horses he called 'Turki' as well as on the outstanding mules found in Anatolia.²⁴ Horse pedigrees were kept, the people of Germiyan knowing 'perfectly well' who were the sires and dams of their horses.²⁵ These horses, at least according to al-'Umari's Genoese informant Balaban (Domenico Doria), were the best in Anatolia, nimble and swift and impossible to outdistance.²⁶ Horses from the Kastamonu region, too, were famous and fetched very high prices, in the early fourteenth century as much as 1,000 gold pieces, which was 'a price thought by those who know about these things to be worth it'.²⁷ It was apparently merely necessary to say that a horse was from Kastamonu to give it extraordinary merit in the eyes of the buyer and ensure a lucrative sale.²⁸ Horse trading was not restricted to the mainland for in the fourteenth century both the Hospitallers, the Genoese on Cyprus and the Venetians on Crete sought to buy horses from the region.²⁹

Horses were not the only animals the Turkomans traded, for they provided animals to the surrounding regions, to Syria, Iraq and Iran which were apparently stocked with livestock from the Turkomans in the early 1300s.³⁰ The nomads also traded cheese, yoghurt, meat, wool and leather with the local sedentary population. This trade with the settled, often Byzantine, population is reflected in the later accounts of the relations between Osman, the eponymous founder of the Ottoman state, and the *tekefur* (Byzantine ruler) of Bilecik (Bekloma) in north-west Anatolia. Osman was said to have given cheese, butter and cream to the *tekefur* to whom he entrusted his goods while he moved to the summer pastures.³¹ As with horses, the trade was not

24 Marco Polo, *The Travels of Marco Polo*, tr. Aldo Ricci (London, 1931), p. 50.

25 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 355. 26 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 355.

27 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 341; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 462.

28 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 341.

29 Anthony Luttrell, 'The Hospitallers of Rhodes Confront the Turks: 1306–1421', in *Christians, Jews and Other Worlds: Patterns of Conflict and Accommodation*, ed. Philip F. Gallagher (Lanham, New York and London, 1988), p. 113; F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1958–61), 1, docs. 38, pp. 30–1, 410, pp. 106–7; 11, doc. 988, p. 12; 1383.viii.1: Archivio di Stato di Genova [hereafter ASG], Cartulare 381, ff. 148r–151r; 1363–5: Andraea Naugerii, 'Historia Veneta', in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. L. A. Muratori, 25 vols. (Milan, 1723–51) [hereafter RIS], vol. xxiii: col. 1049; H. Noiret, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485* (Paris, 1892), pp. 110–11; N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire de croisades au XVe siècle*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1899–1902), 1, p. 102.

30 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', pp. 335–6.

31 Aşıkpaşazade, *Die altosmanische Chronik des Aşıkpaşazade*, ed. Friedrich Giese (Leipzig, 1929; reprinted Osnabrück, 1972), pp. 9, 14.

restricted to internal commerce, for such goods as goats' hair, and leather and hides were among the exports from Anatolia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.³²

Apart from raw products, the Turkomans also wove *kilims* and carpets (also among the gifts from Osman to the *tekfur* of Bilecik).³³ Turkish carpets, which were to be so famous in Europe in later centuries, were exported by the Latin merchants from ports such as Antalya in the south and Balat in western Anatolia.³⁴ Marco Polo commented on the manufacture of beautiful carpets in the mid-twelfth century,³⁵ and the beauty of such carpets from Aksaray was famous from early on.³⁶

While livestock formed a key asset in the nomad economy the Turkomans also benefited from another lucrative economic activity: raiding. The initial impact of such raiding was felt in the immediate aftermath of the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) into the next century. With the greater control imposed by the Seljuks, the impact of Turkoman raiding decreased, but came to the fore once more with the decline of the Seljuks and the subsequent weakening of Mongol authority in the later thirteenth century. The situation began to improve in the fourteenth with the imposition of control by the various beyliks and with the establishment of the Ottoman state. Such raiding provided considerable hauls of booty, in particular slaves who were often taken in great numbers: 26,000 Armenians were seized in Cilicia and sold in the slave markets in 1186,³⁷ and 20,000 captured after the fall of Tralles (Aydın) a century later in 1282.³⁸ By the beginning of the fourteenth century such raiding had taken to the water and Turkish raiding of the Aegean islands was a source of deep concern to the Byzantines and the Latins alike. In one year alone, 1331–2, 25,000 people were snatched from the islands, according to the Venetian Marino Sanudo Torsello, who wrote the

32 Pegolotti, *Fr Balducci Pegolotti, La Pratica della Mercature*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), p. 379; 1337.iii.9 = Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin* (Venice, 1983), docs. 1331M, p. 189, 1337A, p. 192, 1337M, p. 198, 1375M, p. 222, 1403M, p. 231, 1407M, p. 236; Piloti, *L'Égypte au commencement du quinzième siècle d'après le traité d'Emmanuel Piloti de Crète (incipit 1420) avec une introduction et des notes par P.-H. Dopp* (Cairo, 1950), pp. 62, 63, 73; Giacomo Badoer, *Il Libro dei Conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli 1436–1440)*, eds. Umberto Dorini and Tommaso Bertelè (Rome, 1956), pp. 310, 397, 535, 556, 615, 718, 830.

33 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, pp. 9, 14. 34 Piloti, *L'Égypte*, pp. 60, 73.

35 Polo, *Travels*, p. 50. 36 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 161.

37 Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj*, vol. I, tr. E. A. W. Budge (London, 1932), p. 321.

38 Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1829–55), I, p. 142.

Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis urging a crusade against the growing Turkish menace.³⁹

The Turkomans did not only raid on their own account but also provided raiders in various internal Byzantine feuds. It was Turkish reinforcements who contributed to the success of the false Alexios when he revolted against Emperor Alexios Angelos and attacked the towns around Ankara.⁴⁰ Michael, a tax-collector in the province of Mylassa, was supported by Rükneddin when he revolted against the same emperor in the summer of 1200, the Seljuk ruler providing him with troops which he used to ravage the cities along the Meander (Büyük Menderes).⁴¹ Sometimes rebelling Byzantines provided the Turks with more than raiding opportunities and work as mercenaries. When Mangaphas revolted against Emperor Isakios Angelos he took a large number of captives in Caria whom he handed over to the 'local barbarians to be led away into captivity'.⁴²

The land

While Turkoman raiding was a positive factor in the Turkish advance across Anatolia, and the availability of booty attracted forces to the various Turkish leaders, it was not an asset when it came to the establishment of a state economy, and the 'portable' economy of the nomad was not a sound economic basis for state construction. The basis for this was land.

As it had been under the Byzantines, so too agriculture was the backbone of the Turkish economy. This backbone, however, was severely strained by the nomads. Turkoman raiding was disruptive. It ravaged agriculturally productive regions and interfered with trade. Caravans were attacked, roads cut or made unsafe and merchants preyed upon.⁴³ Turkoman raiding meant that in the Ottoman state in the fourteenth century people could only travel in large groups in the *vilayets* (provinces) of Amasya and Tokat, and even then not with impunity.⁴⁴ Fighting often involved scorched-earth tactics. In the

39 Marino Sanudo, *Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren, Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. VII, ed. Fr. Kuntsmann (Munich, 1855), no. 5, p. 797.

40 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 254.

41 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 290.

42 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 220.

43 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, tr. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (Istanbul, 2007), pp. 162–3, 211; Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, *Selçuki Devletleri Tarihi. Aksaraylı Kerimeddin Mahmud'un Müsameret al-ahyar Adlı Farsça Tarihinin Tercümesi*, tr. M. Nuri Gencosman (Ankara, 1943), p. 211; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, I, pp. 321, 453; Ahmed Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkibeleri*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı (Istanbul, 2006), pp. 386, 680; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, pp. 427–8, 448.

44 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 99.

summer of 1176, for example, the Turks, avoiding any major encounter other than light skirmishes, destroyed the grass in order to prevent the Byzantines finding forage for their horses, and contaminated the water, thus denying them pure drinking water.⁴⁵ They had adopted similar tactics when faced with the approach of the forces of the first crusade and had laid waste to the area around Konya before withdrawing.⁴⁶ The Turkoman problem was not merely a matter of raiding, however, for the land itself was also important to them. It was on the fertile plains that 'their herds of goats and cattle grazed, romping in the verdant meadows',⁴⁷ and it was for this reason that Manuel's rebuilding of Dorylaion (Eskişehir) was of such concern for it threatened to force them to abandon their pasture lands.⁴⁸

Turkoman attacks put a severe strain on the agricultural economy. Peasants were forced to abandon their fields and to protect their flocks and herds by keeping them within the towns. The inhabitants of Tavas in the early fourteenth century kept their livestock within the town walls at night because of the occupation of the countryside by the Turkomans,⁴⁹ as did the inhabitants of Laodikeia (Ladik, modern Denizli) who lost countless animals, and men, to Kılıç Arslan II after his successful siege of the city.⁵⁰ Turkish sieges meant that the fields around besieged towns remained uncultivated for the inhabitants could not come out to tend them. In consequence, the townspeople were often faced with starvation. Turkoman attacks in 1256–7, for example, devastated the countryside round Melitene (Malatya) and reduced its inhabitants to starvation.⁵¹ The inhabitants of Antalya, under Turkish siege in 1147, were luckier for although they were unable to cultivate their fields, they were able to import grain by sea.⁵² Devastation of the surrounding agricultural land and destruction of crops was a common occurrence, caused not merely by the Turkomans. The Mamluks, too, ravaged the crops and land around the citadel of Sis when they laid siege to it in 1320, and drove off great numbers of cattle.⁵³ It was starvation that reduced many towns and delivered them into the hands of the Turks. Gangra (Çankırı) was starved into submission in 1136

45 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 101.

46 William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds done beyond the Sea*, 2 vols., tr. Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York, 1943), 1, p. 177.

47 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 99. 48 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 99.

49 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 428. 50 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 71.

51 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, 1, pp. 426–7.

52 William of Tyre, *History*, 11, p. 178: 'It possesses very rich fields, which are nevertheless, of no advantage to the townspeople, for they are surrounded by enemies on all sides who hinder their cultivation. Therefore, the fertile soil lies fallow, since there is no one to work it.'

53 Abu'l Fida, *The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince*, tr. P. M. Holt (Wiesbaden, 1983), p. 79.

‘while the emperor’s attention was diverted with other grave issues’,⁵⁴ as was Trailles, which fell to Menteşe, and Nysa, Tripolis and Thyraia, reduced by Emir Sassan.⁵⁵ Prusa (Bursa), put under a siege so tight that ‘an infidel could not even extend a finger out of the castle’,⁵⁶ fell to the Ottoman ruler Orhan in 1326 as a result of starvation, as did Nicaea (İznik) in 1331, and Nicomedia (İzmit), in 1337.⁵⁷ When Bayezid I put Constantinople under siege in the 1390s he did not do this, as Doukas notes, by actually waging war against the city. There were no siege engines or military engines. Instead he deployed men around the city to prevent anything entering or leaving. In consequence, there was a terrible dearth of grain, wine, oil and other provisions.⁵⁸

Failure to cultivate land as a result of Turkoman activity put a severe financial burden on the Byzantine state which sought to protect productive land where possible. In Choniates’s estimation, Manuel’s ‘best deed’ was to fortify the villages and build fortresses to protect the horse-breeding plains in the region of Pergamon (Bergama) and Atramyttion (Edremit) which were prey to Turkish raiding in the 1160s and 1170s. As a result of Manuel’s actions the region prospered, fields were cultivated and crops abounded.⁵⁹

The Turkomans were, of course, not the only ones to raid. Devastation of agricultural land was also brought about by various rebelling Byzantines who called in Turkish forces. One such, a man claiming to be Alexios, son of Emperor Manuel, earned himself the nickname ‘crop-burner’ during his revolt against Isakios Angelos, when he ravaged cities along the Meander (Büyük Menderes) with Turkish forces and laid waste the cultivated fields.⁶⁰ Mangaphas, who also revolted against Isakios Angelos, recruited Turks for his attacks on Byzantine farmers, killing draught animals and burning and destroying the grain fields in the summer time.⁶¹ Byzantine forces, too, state or rebel, could devastate with or without Turkish assistance, destroying crops and seizing flocks and shepherds.⁶² Manuel Komnenos took large numbers of men and animals captive in his attack on the lands round Pentapolis,⁶³ while his successor, John Komnenos, attacked Konya and despoiled the enemy’s land, taking captive both men and animals of all kind, draught animals as well as

54 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 13.

55 George Pachymeres, *De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis libri XIII*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1835), I, pp. 470, 474, II, pp. 433–6, 589.

56 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 23. According to Oruç, *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, ed. Atsız (Istanbul, 1972), p. 31, no one could leave the castle.

57 Gregoras, *Historia*, vol. I, VIII, 15, p. 384, IX, 9, p. 433, XI, 6, p. 545.

58 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 83. 59 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 85.

60 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 222. 61 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 220.

62 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 110. 63 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 70.

those suited to riding.⁶⁴ During the civil war of 1341–7, John Kantakouzenos burned and sacked villages and towns between Selymbria and Constantinople, causing great destruction and desolation.⁶⁵

Turkoman raids, therefore, so useful in devastating the land of the enemy and for fighting, advancing and capturing territory, were not so useful when it came to state control. Once towns began to fall and Turkish states started to emerge, the level of disruption caused by Turkoman activity became as unacceptable to the Turkish rulers as it had been to the Byzantines. For all administrations, Byzantine, Mongol or Turkish, nomads were a problem and were generally disliked by the settled populations. States therefore sought to control them, to tax them, settle them or force them to move elsewhere. What was important was to control the land, protect and increase its productivity, and tax it.

Under the Turkish system of landholding all land, with few exceptions, was state land (*miri*). Land could be granted as freehold (*mülk*), assigned as a land grant (*ikta* under the Seljuks and *timar* under the Ottomans who assigned such lands to maintain troops), or placed in a *vakıf*, a pious endowment.⁶⁶ In times of difficulty rulers could resort to giving as gifts extensive lands as private property, as Rükneddin did, or of selling them, as was done by İzzeddin.⁶⁷ Land was also no doubt simply appropriated on occasion, as indicated by Rashid-al-Din's drive to reclaim illegally appropriated land at the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁶⁸ While the Ottoman landholding system owed much to that of the Seljuks, it was not simply a straight continuation, but was affected also by the impact of Mongol rule, and by Byzantine practice, in Anatolia, as well as by systems in place in the Balkan regions which the Ottomans conquered.

As land was a source of wealth for the state, it was therefore essential in order effectively to assess revenue that the state should know the productivity of the land under its control. This was achieved through a system of land surveying, which under the Ottomans resulted in detailed, and regular, inventories of villages, peasants, animals and crops, and the tax revenue produced. Immediately after the conquest of a region, a survey (*tahrir*) of the land and population was conducted, listing tax returns, productivity and property.⁶⁹

64 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 18. 65 Doukas, *Decline*, pp. 73–4.

66 Osman Turan, 'Selçuk Türkiyesi'nde Faizle Para İkrasına Dair Hukuki Bir Vesika', *Belleten* 16, 62 (1952), 252–4. For the *timar* system see chapter 6 in this volume.

67 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 329. 68 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 329.

69 For what appears to be the earliest extant example of a *tahrir*, see Halil İnalcık (ed.), *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1987).

The results of such a survey were entered into a detailed register, a *defter-i mufassal*. Another, less-detailed summary register was also drawn up, the *defter-i icmal*, which gave only the names of the villages and the administrative divisions, and annual production figures. These registers listed the number of households (*hane*), widows and unmarried men in a region, together with the total return from the region. Such registers give other details such as the number of orchards, olive trees, vineyards and beehives and production figures for crops such as wheat, corn and grain, fruit such as grapes, or other agricultural products such as honey. Little is known about what taxes were charged under the Seljuks but under the Ottomans agricultural taxes included the *çift resmi*, the *çift* tax charged on Muslims working on the land. The *ispence* paid by Christian peasants in the Balkans was equivalent to the *çift resmi*, and was charged at the rate of 25 *akçes* per non-Muslim married man and 6 *akçes* from a widow in the fifteenth century.⁷⁰ Tithes, *rüsum* (dues from a range of things including vineyards, grain mills, beehives as well as market dues, bride tax and fines) and *avarız-i divaniye* (extraordinary levies) were also charged. Non-Muslims also paid the *cizye*, a poll-tax.

As in any system in which agricultural production was significant, it was vital to ensure that peasants remained on the land. This was a problem which faced all Turkish administrations, as it had the Byzantine, when warfare, raiding, famine and, in the case of an increasingly hard-pressed Byzantine administration, excessive taxation all drove the peasants from the land. To avoid this, Turkish rulers took various measures: transferring populations to uncultivated land, granting tax breaks to keep peasants in place and to attract others, and providing implements and seeds. A good example of the care exerted by Turkish rulers is the treatment of 5,000 Byzantines captured in 1198 by the Seljuk ruler Keyhusrev in a series of attacks in the Meander region and in Phrygia. Having had a list drawn up of the captives, giving their names and where they came from, Keyhusrev then transferred them to Philomilon (Akşehir) and assigned them to land there, providing them with grain and seed. Promising that if an agreement was reached with the Byzantine emperor they would be returned home, he guaranteed that if no such agreement materialised they would remain tax free for five years, after which they would be taxed lightly, never at a rate greater than that which they had paid to the Byzantine authorities. This policy was successful for it ensured that the captured Byzantines settled and even attracted others who had not themselves been captured but had heard of this favourable treatment. In the words of Choniates the

⁷⁰ İnalcık, *Defter*, pp. xxxii–xxxiii.

Byzantines thus 'preferred to settle among the barbarians rather than in the Hellenic cities and gladly quit their homelands'.⁷¹

Under the Ottomans, abandoned land was handed for cultivation to dervishes, or to state slaves and serfs who were also provided with seeds and oxen. Mehmed II used prisoners of war and Turkomans to settle villages deserted by the Greeks after the capture of Constantinople in 1453.⁷²

Anatolia was an agriculturally rich region. While the central plateau provided abundant pasture lands, the west, south and east produced grain, cotton, pulses and vegetables, fruit, rice, honey, as white as snow, and excellent sugar, neither too sweet nor too bitter.⁷³ There was vine cultivation,⁷⁴ and grapes were exported from the region,⁷⁵ as was wine, produced in the south, in the Aegean region and in Cappadocia.⁷⁶ Wine formed part of the revenue of the Seljuk sultan in the mid-twelfth century,⁷⁷ and was exported from Fethiye in the south, from the Aegean coast, and from the north, from İncir Limanı (Paralime, Liminia) and Giresun (Kerasunt).⁷⁸ Wine was also imported into the region, a trade in which the Genoese played an important role. It was imported into Gelibolu and Menteşe, and from Naples it was traded into Theologos.⁷⁹

One of Anatolia's most important products was grain, one of the main export commodities in the trade between the Turks and the European merchants. Grain was vital for the Latin trading colonies in the eastern Mediterranean and even on occasion for the mother cities of Genoa and Venice. The importance of this commodity is highlighted by Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini who in his chronicle of the years 1212–1354 regarded it as a cause

71 Choniates, *Annals*, pp. 272–3.

72 Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, vol. I (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 167–9.

73 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', pp. 335, 336, 356, 358, 367; Betrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 100, 138, 204; Zeki Velidi Togan, 'Reşideddin'in Mektuplarında Anadolu'nun İktisadi ve Medeni Hayatına Ait Kayıtlar', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 15, 1–4 (1953–4), 33–49; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, pp. 418, 422, 430; Mustaufi, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulüb Composed by Hamd-Allāh Mustawfī of Qazwin in 740 [1340]*, tr. G. Le Strange (Leiden, 1919), pp. 102, 103, 104, 105.

74 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 160; Togan, 'Reşideddin'in Mektuplarında', p. 10; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 309; Mustaufi, *Geographical*, pp. 103, 104, 105.

75 Piloti, *L'Égypte*, pp. 61, 62–3; Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 27, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89.

76 S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism* (Berkeley, 1971), p. 483; Franz Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*, tr. Ralph Manheim (Princeton, 1978), p. 399; Bertrand de la Broquière, *Voyage*, p. 100.

77 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum*, ed. Jean Richard (Paris, 1965), p. 69.

78 G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur Älteren Handels und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit Besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante. vom Neunten bis zum Ausgang des Fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1856–7), III, no. 370, pp. 159–68.

79 Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 76–9.

of the western crusade against Aydın in 1344.⁸⁰ The beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın were active in trading grain with the European merchants, and it was sold and exported from Theologos and Phokaea to Cyprus and the west. The Ottomans traded it from the early days of their state's existence, and the Venetians were buying grain from Orhan in 1333.⁸¹ The Ottomans also sold to the Genoese.⁸² Grain was exported too from the Black Sea region, from Thrace, from Tarsus and Antalya.⁸³ Even the Hospitallers, whose *raison d'être* was the struggle against the infidel, obtained grain from the Turks and were granted a papal dispensation to do so in 1379.⁸⁴ Grain was not the only agricultural produce which the western merchants purchased for they also looked to Anatolia for vegetables and pulses which they bought, for example, in Antalya⁸⁵ and the markets of the Aegean coastal region. The Genoese on Chios bought biscuit from Aydın⁸⁶ and the Hospitallers on Rhodes obtained foodstuffs from Turkish rulers.⁸⁷

Anatolia was also a region of mineral resources. There were silver mines,⁸⁸ iron mines⁸⁹ (one of which in Karaman was credited by al-'Umari with greatly contributing to the success of the beylik⁹⁰), salt mines⁹¹ and lapis lazuli quarries.⁹² High-quality copper was mined in north-east Anatolia in the region of Kastamonu, Sinop, Samsun and Osmaniye.⁹³ According to the Byzantine chronicler Kritoboulos, copper was the most important produce of the Sinop region,⁹⁴ while another Byzantine contemporary, Chalkokondyles, estimated that the annual tax income from the mines of Sinop when Mehmed II

80 'Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini (1212–1354)', *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. G. Carducci and V. Fiorini, vol. 16, pt 3 (Città di Castello, 1912), pp. 50–1.

81 Thiriet, *Régestes*, 1, doc. 38, pp. 30–1.

82 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2729. doc. 26, published in Kate Fleet, 'The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 56, 1 (1993), 15.

83 Michel Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIe–début du XVe siècle)*, 2 vols. (Genoa and Paris, 1978), II, pp. 761, 762; Lamberto di Sambuceto in Valeria Polonio, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (3 luglio 1300–3 Agosto 1301)* (Genoa, 1982), no. 139, pp. 155–6; Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 39.

84 Anthony Luttrell, 'Intrigue, Schism, and Violence among the Hospitallers of Rhodes: 1377–1384', *Speculum* 41 (1966), 35.

85 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 57–8. 86 1351.v.26: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2727, doc. 43, f. iv.

87 Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', pp. 35, 113.

88 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, pp. 68–9; al-'Umari, 'Voyages', pp. 337, 350, 354; Mustafa, *Geographical*, pp. 193–4.

89 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69. 90 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 348.

91 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69. 92 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69.

93 Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1843), p. 498.

94 Kritoboulos, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, by Kritoboulos, tr. C. T. Riggs (Westport, Conn., 1954), p. 166.

conquered the region in the middle fifteenth century was 50,000 gold pieces.⁹⁵ During Mehmed II's reign the area of Kastamonu produced 'infinite' amounts of copper.⁹⁶ With the Ottoman takeover in the Balkans, further mines fell into Turkish hands, as they did, for example, after the battle of Kosovo in 1389.⁹⁷

As with wine, Anatolia was both an exporter and importer of metals. The metal trade is a particularly difficult one to trace, both because of the scarcity of primary data for the early period, and because of the bans imposed by western governments and the church on the trade in metals with the Muslim world. It is often argued that such bans led not to a halting of the trade, but merely to it being concealed. However, it is possible that, rather than existing secretly, there was in fact not the volume of imports implied by this argument. Anatolia was both a producing and exporting region, and so did not need to import much of its metal needs. While firearms did arrive in Turkish territory⁹⁸ and guns were used, for example, at the battle of Varna in 1444,⁹⁹ what perhaps was more significant than hardware and metals was the importation of expertise, such as that of the Hungarian cannon maker Orban who forged the cannon which destroyed the walls of Constantinople and delivered the city into Ottoman hands in 1453.¹⁰⁰

Metals were exported to the west.¹⁰¹ Lead was exported westwards as well as to Egypt; copper was exported in considerable quantities, the İsfendi-yaroğulları ruler Süleyman trading it with the Genoese in the 1390s,¹⁰² and Turkish merchants apparently trading it on Chios.¹⁰³ Silver was sold in the markets of Antalya and Theologos,¹⁰⁴ and gold appeared in the markets of Antalya and Edirne.¹⁰⁵ Anatolia also imported metals, such as iron which sold

95 Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, p. 489.

96 Iacopo de Promontorio, *Aufzeichnungen*, p. 67. 97 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 58.

98 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 60; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, II, pp. 782–3, 840–1.

99 Oruç, *Tarihi*, p. 94, refers to guns at the battle, and notes that there were no guns in the time of Timur, p. 104. Doukas in his description of Mehmed II's siege of Constantinople states that the Turks had even better guns than the Byzantines; *Decline*, p. 212.

100 Doukas, *Decline*, pp. 200–1. Doukas calls the cannon 'a terrifying and extraordinary monster' and gives a description of its being tested by Mehmed II.

101 For the metal trade see Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 112–21.

102 1390.i.11: ASG, *Notai Cartulare* 476, doc. 26. A summary of this document is given in Michel Balard, Angeliki E. Laiou and C. Otten-Froux, *Les Italiens à Byzance: édition et présentation de documents* (Paris, 1987), no. 82, p. 37.

103 1404.xii.31: ASG, *Notaio Gregorio Panissario*, Sc. 37, filze 1, doc. 48; Paola Piana Toniolo, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Chio da Gregorio Panissario (1403–1405)* (Genoa, 1995), doc. 52, p. 105.

104 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 56, 58. 105 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58; Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 181, 462.

in Antalya and Bursa, and which the Genoese traded into Balat around the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century.¹⁰⁶ The Genoese imported tin into Balat and it was also sold in Antalya.¹⁰⁷

One of the most important mineral resources of Anatolia was alum, vital to the European cloth industry as a fixer in dyes. Until the discovery of alum mines south of Rome in the second half of the fifteenth century, Anatolia remained the main source of this mineral which was a major export item in the trade between the Turks and the European merchants. Alum from Anatolia appeared as far west as Spain and England.¹⁰⁸ It was being produced and traded in the thirteenth century when the alum resources of the Seljuks were handled by two merchants, the Genoese Nicolao de Santo-Siro and the Venetian Benefatio de Molendino.¹⁰⁹ The Turkish alum trade was largely dominated by the Genoese, the Zaccaria family controlling alum extraction in the early fourteenth century. The Maona of Chios controlled the alum of Phokaea from 1346, and the Gattilusio family, having established themselves on Lesbos a decade later, monopolised the alum production there and on the other islands of the northern Aegean. By the 1440s extraction and export was in the hands of a cartel when in 1449 a major partnership was established under the control of Francesco Draperio.¹¹⁰

The main producing regions were Karahisar in the Black Sea region, Kütahya and Phokaea (Foça).¹¹¹ Smaller quantities came from Ulubad (Ulek Abad, west of Bursa), Camalı (south of Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli)) and Kapıdağ (Cyzicus, west of Bursa). Simon de Saint-Quentin referred to a valuable alum mine near Sivas and a mine of alum and kermes near Hacsar.¹¹² Al-'Umari talks of an alum mine in Germiyan, sales from which brought in considerable riches.¹¹³

106 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58; Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 652, 653, 698; Piloti, *L'Egypte*, p. 72.

107 Piloti, *L'Egypte*, p. 72; Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

108 For the alum trade see Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 80–94.

109 William of Rubruck, *The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck. His Journey to the Court of the Great Khan Möngke, 1253–1255*, eds. Peter Jackson and David Morgan (London, 1990), p. 27.

110 1449.iv.1: ASG, Notai Antichi 487, f. 11. For this partnership, and for alum production in general, see Kate Fleet, 'Osmanlı Topraklarında Latin Ticareti (XIV–XV. Yüzyıllar)', in *Osmanlı*, ed. Güler Eren, Kemal Çiçek and Cem Oğuz, 12 vols. (Ankara, 1999), III, pp. 81–5.

111 R. Muntaner, *L'expedició dels Catalans a Orient*, ed. Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer (Barcelona, 1926), p. 156. All ships sailing from Phokaea to the west took a cargo of alum and Phokaea supplied French, German, Italian, Spanish, Arab, Egyptian and Syrian dye makers; Doukas, *Decline*, p. 148.

112 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69.

113 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 356.

The urban market

The economy which developed under the Turks was not restricted to a rural base for it also involved the development of an urban economy. One of the characteristics of the fourteenth century was the multiplication of medium-sized towns.¹¹⁴

As the Turks advanced across Anatolia, and under the Ottomans into the Balkans, they took many of the towns that lay in their path, mostly by starving them into submission. Simon de Saint-Quentin refers to a hundred towns in the Seljuk state in the mid-thirteenth century, listing among others Sivas, Antalya, Alanya, where he states the sultan kept his treasury, Malatya, Erzurum, Konya and Niksar.¹¹⁵ Such urban centres and ports were important markets for both local and international trade, and were production centres for goods such as carpets and worked cloth, and industries, such as shipbuilding, noted in Antalya by the Cretan merchant Emanuele Piloti, writing in the early fourteenth century.¹¹⁶ Siirt produced excellent brass utensils and 'famous and incomparable' goblets, according to Mustaufi.¹¹⁷ Good quality cloth was manufactured in Denizli and Akşehir,¹¹⁸ woollen goods in Sivas and Kastamonu in the mid-thirteenth century,¹¹⁹ *kemha*, velvet and scarlets in Erzincan, linen cloth in Erbil and Siirt, and silk in Bursa.¹²⁰ Aksaray produced rugs of sheep's wool which, according to Ibn Battuta, had no equal in any country and were exported to Syria, Egypt, Iraq, India and China.¹²¹ Large quantities of silk were produced in the region.¹²² The manufacture of rich, high-quality silks of various colours was noted by Marco Polo, who also commented on the beautiful buckram made by the Armenians of Erzincan.¹²³ Cloth production was not just for local consumption and cloth was exported from Anatolia.¹²⁴ Sheep's wool and very high-quality goat's wool was worked up into hats of *bonnet* (a kind of cloth) which were apparently sent for sale in France and England.¹²⁵ Erzincan buckram sold in

114 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 335. 115 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, pp. 67–8.

116 Piloti, *L'Égypte*, pp. 61, 73. 117 Mustaufi, *Geographical*, p. 104.

118 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 52; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmet A. Köymen, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1949 and 1957), I, p. 204; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 425.

119 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 320.

120 Togan, 'Resideddin'in Mektuplarında', p. 10; Johannes Schiltberger, *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1396–1427*, tr. J. Buchan Telfer (London, 1879), p. 34.

121 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, pp. 42–3. 122 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 366.

123 Marco Polo, *Le Livre de Marco Polo citoyen de Venise conseiller privé et commissaire impérial de Khoubilai-Kaân rédigé en français sous sa dictée en 1298 par Rusticien de Pise*, ed. M. G. Pauthier, vol. II (Paris, 1865), pp. 37–8, 50; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 437.

124 Piloti, *L'Égypte*, pp. 61–2. 125 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69.

Pera and Constantinople¹²⁶ and much further afield, in Pisa.¹²⁷ Silk cloth, which formed part of the annual tribute paid by the Seljuks to the Mongols (together with horses, camels, rams and money) according to Simon de Saint-Quentin,¹²⁸ was also exported, both Iranian silk which had been brought into Anatolia, and Turkish silk, *seta turci*.¹²⁹ Much of the Anatolian silk was exported to Byzantium and the west. This was ideal for the manufacture of Greek taffeta, most of which was made from this source.¹³⁰ Silk traded out of Antalya and Alanya went not just to Constantinople but also to Alexandria.¹³¹ Turkish silk appeared, too, in markets much further west, such as Pisa.¹³²

A thriving economy required thriving towns, and so Turkish rulers set out to ensure that the urban centres they captured flourished. As with land, it was imperative to ensure that the population remained in place, or was reinforced or replaced by people brought, either forcibly or through various inducements, from elsewhere. Osman was said to have repopulated the empty town of Karaca Hisar after its capture with people from Germiyan.¹³³ Murad II brought people in from the surrounding area and settled them in Thessalonike after its conquest by Ottoman forces in 1430, giving houses as freehold to those who stayed willingly and encouraging those who had fled the city to return to their homes, promising them amnesty. Captives were ransomed and had their homes returned to them.¹³⁴ Mehmed II, too, hastened to encourage the repopulation of Constantinople, bringing in people from all regions of the empire as part of his drive to recreate a thriving commercial capital and erecting *bedestans* (buildings in a bazaar used for valuable goods), caravansaries and markets.¹³⁵ In Pera he ordered a survey of the inhabitants. Finding many houses bolted as the Latins had fled, he ordered them opened and an inventory taken of their belongings. He stipulated that should the owners return within three months, they would be allowed to reclaim their possessions. If not, then all would be confiscated by the ruler.¹³⁶

126 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 36. 127 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 208.

128 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 85. 129 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 208.

130 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 366. 131 Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 60, 63.

132 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 208–9. 133 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 20.

134 Johannis Anagnostes, *Selanik (Thessaloniki)* in *Son Zaptı Hakkında Bir Tarihi (Sultan II. Murad Dönemine Ait Bir Bizans Kaynağı)*, tr. Melek Delilbaşı (Ankara, 1989), p. 41, Greek text p. 28; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, II, pp. 610–13; Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, bab. 104; Doukas, *Decline*, p. 172.

135 Kritoboulos, *History*, pp. 104–5; Tursun Bey, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror by Tursun Beg*, ed. Halil İnalcık and Rhoads Murphey (Minneapolis and Chicago, 1978), ff. 53a–55b.

136 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 240.

Not a great deal is known about the urban landscape under the early Turkish rulers. One of the most tantalising details concerns the *ahis*. The *ahis* were apparently an important element of the urban fabric from the early days of the Turkish conquest. From Ibn Battuta's account of his travels in Anatolia in the 1330s they appear to have formed some kind of trade-related organisation, and were certainly widespread. But quite what their role was or how their organisation functioned is far from clear.¹³⁷

Even if certain aspects of urban development are obscure, however, it is clear that the urban economy was important for Turkish rulers who encouraged urban development and promoted the urban market. Urban economic prosperity guaranteed the state important revenues and was thus something to be nurtured. Immediately after conquering a town, one of the actions of the new Turkish ruler was to establish a market, along with a mosque and a *hamam* (bathhouse). The eponymous Ottoman ruler Osman, thus, is credited with having established markets in Eskişehir and Karaca Hisar.¹³⁸ It was not sufficient, however, merely to establish a market, for its security also had to be guaranteed in order to attract traders. The importance of an effectively regulated market is illustrated by Aşıkpaşazade's account of Osman's behaviour in protecting the rights of the infidels who traded in the market he established at Eskişehir. According to the story, Byzantines from Bilecik made good jugs which they sold in the market. When a man from Germiyan bought a jug but failed to pay for it, the men from Bilecik complained to Osman. The man was punished and Osman forbade the damaging of Byzantine interests. 'Because commerce was thus conducted justly and the situation progressed well, even the women of the infidels of Bilecik came to the market at Eskişehir, and did their shopping and came and went and carried out their business in safety.' Although Aşıkpaşazade's chronicle was written much later, in the late fifteenth century, and it is not unlikely that the story is more legend than fact, yet it still indicates something of Ottoman policy in the period and gives an idea of the pragmatic approach to the workings of the market.¹³⁹

The official in charge of the market was the *muhtesib*. Subordinate to the *kadı* he was responsible for law and order, for controlling trade, and for checking prices and the quality of goods on the market. It was his job to prevent fraud and ensure that the correct prices were charged and true weights and measures used. The issue of weights and measures was an important one. In the beyliks

¹³⁷ For *ahis* see Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 193–200, and chapter 8 in this volume.

¹³⁸ Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, pp. 14, 20.

¹³⁹ Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, pp. 14–15.

of Menteşe and Aydın in the fourteenth century three copies of weights and measures were made, one copy each being kept by two officials of the emir and the Venetian consul.¹⁴⁰ As other western merchants, in particular the Genoese, were also trading there and in Anatolia in general, it seems likely that a similar system was applied also for them and presumably in places other than these two beyliks, although we lack any evidence of this.

While it is clear that standardisation of some sort applied to weights and measures in the marketplace, it is not at all clear now what such weights and measures represented. The Venetian merchant Zibaldone da Canal complained vociferously about the constant fluctuation of the *modius* in Ayas. No one, he wrote, could say exactly what the measure was because the Armenians increased it and decreased it as they wished.¹⁴¹ That fluctuations occurred is also indicated by the clauses in the Venetian treaties with Menteşe and Aydın which stipulated that another measure, the *shinik*, should be restored to its previous weight.¹⁴² The variation of weight according to locality is also reflected in the sale of copper in 1390 to the partnership of Constantino de Groto and Raffaele Capello who bought 16,000 pounds of copper from Süleyman Paşa, the İsfendiyar ruler, at the weight of 'Solimambasa Turchus'.¹⁴³ A variety of weights and measures were in use in Turkish territories, both local and foreign, such as the *mann*, the *modius* (or *modio* or *moggio*), the *batman* (or *battimano* or *patumani*), the *shinik*, the *botte*, the *braccia*, the *canna*, the *capsa* or *casa* (a container for soap), the *chanela*, the *fardello*, the *kantar*, the *mazo*, the *migliaro*, the *mine*, the *rotol*, the *seruch* and the cloth measure the *staperronos*. Another weight of which the value was far from fixed was the Ottoman *yük*, described by Halil İnalcık as 'one of the most varied and imprecise measures in the Ottoman empire'.¹⁴⁴ According to al-'Umari there were two chief measures in operation in Anatolia in the earlier fourteenth century, the *mudd* (a unit of capacity) and the *ratl* (a unit of weight).

This problem of fixing value applies equally to the coinage used by the Turks in the period before the conquest of Constantinople, and the coinage, too, presents a confusing picture. The first minting appears to date to the period

140 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337M, p. 198, 1375M, p. 222, 1353A, p. 215.

141 Zibaldone da Canal, *Zibaldone da Canal, manoscritto mercantile del sec. XIV*, ed. A. Stussu (Venice, 1967), pp. 62, 109–10.

142 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337M, p. 198, 1375M, p. 222, 1353A, p. 215.

143 1390.i.ii: ASG, Notai Cartulare 476, doc. 26. A summary of this document is given in Balard *et al.*, *Documents*, no. 82, p. 37.

144 Halil İnalcık, 'Bursa I XV Asır Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihine Dair Vesikaları', *Belleten* 24, 93 (1960), 57.

of the Danişmendid Gümüştekin and the Seljuk ruler Mesud. At this point the coinage was only copper, and thus for local trade, silver coins not appearing until the reign of Kılıç Arslan II,¹⁴⁵ and gold not until the thirteenth century. The predominant coin in the eastern Mediterranean until the fourteenth century was the Byzantine gold coin, the *hyperpyron*, which, by the middle of that century, had become a money of account. The *hyperpyron* was superseded by the new 'dollar' currency, the florin, in turn ousted by the Venetian ducat which became the dominant currency of the fifteenth century. The common coin in use in Turkish territory in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was the silver *akçe* (Greek *aspron*, Latin *asper*), the weight of which varied according to where it was minted. The copper bought by the Genoese merchants in 1390 from the İsfendiyar ruler Süleyman Paşa, for example, was sold for 471,000 *akçes* of Kastamonu.¹⁴⁶ The Turks also struck copper coins, the *mangır*. The lack of uniformity in the monetary system is indicated by al-'Umari's account according to which each beylik struck its own coinage which did not circulate in any other state. According to al-'Umari the *dirhem* (here meaning the *akçe*) was in general worth three-quarters of an Egyptian *dirhem*.¹⁴⁷ Exchange rates apparently fluctuated constantly, at least in the fifteenth century. The Turkish *akçe* / *hyperpyron* exchange rate fluctuated daily on the Constantinople money market, although remaining in the range of approximately 10.5 to 11 *akçes* per *hyperpyron*. In this period the exchange rate between the *akçe* of Samsun and the *hyperpyron* was around 19:1, thus making the exchange rate between an Ottoman *akçe* and the *akçe* of Samsun around 1:1.73. The *akçe* / ducat rate in the same period was around 33:1.¹⁴⁸

Apart from the Turkish coins, there were also counterfeit Venetian ducats in circulation, struck in certain of the beyliks. This practice resulted in clashes between Venice and the beyliks for the Venetians regarded it as damaging to their interests. In 1368 the Venetian senate despatched an ambassador to Aydın and in consequence the emir agreed to desist from striking imitation ducats and to destroy the mould for minting.¹⁴⁹ Menteşe was less co-operative for, despite a dispute with Venice over imitation ducats, it persisted in minting them.¹⁵⁰ Apart from ducats, the Turks also produced imitations of the silver

145 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 168–9.

146 1390.i.11: ASG, Notai Cartulare 476, doc. 26.

147 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', pp. 335, 336, 355. 148 See Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 142–6.

149 Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 451, pp. 115–16, no. 481, p. 122, no. 481, pp. 160–1.

150 G. Thomas and R. Predelli (eds.), *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, 2 vols. (Venice, 1890–9), II, no. 95, pp. 160–1.

gigliato, a Latin coin originating in Naples,¹⁵¹ and there were false *akçe*, too, in circulation.¹⁵²

While barter remained a method of trade throughout the period, cash payment grew in importance and certainly the Ottomans appear to have been keen to receive payment in this way. In 1441 the Ragusan government was concerned over the need to acquire silver because the Turks required payment for everything in money.¹⁵³ Apart from barter and cash, another method of payment seems to have been in use in Turkish territories by the first half of the fifteenth century. This was the bill of exchange. Such bills, which originated in Genoa at the end of the twelfth century,¹⁵⁴ allowed a merchant to buy goods using a bill of exchange, drawn up in one place but settled in another. A merchant could thus buy a bill of exchange in one city by paying a drawer or taker who drew up the bill. The bill of exchange was then sent to another merchant in another town who presented it there to the payer, who acted as the agent for the drawer, and settled the amount. It seems that western merchants started to use them in Ottoman territory, at least in dealings with their own agents there, by the fifteenth century and various examples of letters of credit used by western merchants in Gelibolu and Edirne are listed in the accounts of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer dating from the 1430s.¹⁵⁵

The markets in which the merchants, both local and foreign, used their coins, bartered or produced their letters of credit were hubs of commercial activity. Markets such as those of Bursa, Konya and Sivas were thriving centres of international trade. Sivas, where east–west and south–north routes converged, was a meeting place of merchants from Iran, Egypt and Syria as well as for Russian and Kitchak traders from the north.¹⁵⁶ Iranian merchants also frequented the markets of Konya, a large and thriving trading town,¹⁵⁷ and of

151 P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.–14. Jh.* (Istanbul, 1934), p. 155; P. Lambros, 'Monnaie inédite de Sarukhan émir d'Ionie, frappée à Ephèse (1299–1346)', *Revue Numismatique*, n.s., 14 (1869–70), 340; S. Bendall and C. Morrison, 'Un trésor de ducats d'imitation au nom d'Andrea Dandolo (1343–1354)', *Revue Numismatique*, 6th series, 21 (1979), 186; J. Karabacek, 'Gigliato des karischen Turkomanenfürsten Urchan-beg', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 9 (1877), 200–15; J. Karabacek, 'Gigliato des jonischen Turkomanenfürsten Omar-beg', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 2 (1870), 525–38.

152 Badoer, *Libro*, p. 462, 501.

153 B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au moyen-âge* (Paris and The Hague, 1961), no. 971, pp. 325–6.

154 Peter Spufford, *Handbook of Medieval Exchange* (London, 1986), p. xxxi.

155 Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 110, 111, 131, 187, 252, 375, 411, 465, 468, 471.

156 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 167; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 434.

157 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, p. 245; Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkibeleri*, p. 131; Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, p. 110.

those of the ‘great and important city’¹⁵⁸ of Bursa where they sold raw silks of Astarabad and Gilan, musk and rhubarb from China and Central Asia, and Chinese porcelain.¹⁵⁹ Here they purchased the imported velvets, brocades and woollens brought by the western merchants who in turn bought spices, cotton, silks and slaves.¹⁶⁰ Ports in the south, such as Alanya and Antalya, a bustling city frequented by a constant flow of travellers,¹⁶¹ and ‘one of the finest . . . and most handsome cities to be seen anywhere as well as most populous and best organized’,¹⁶² were linked by sea with Egypt and the west.¹⁶³ They were markets for imported European cloth such as *scarlattini*, camlets, buckram and *panni gentili*.¹⁶⁴ Well aware of Turkish preferences, the western merchants were careful to bring in cloth in the cuts and colours which the Turks liked, bright scarlets, pistache green and yellows selling well on the Antalya market. The market there also sold spun gold and silver,¹⁶⁵ spices and cotton, bought by European merchants, and timber and wool, exported to Egypt.¹⁶⁶

Cloth, which sold in the markets throughout Turkish-controlled territory, was one of the main import items brought in both from the west and from Iran and further east as well as from the Mamluk sultanate. Silk fabrics came into Anatolia from Syria, worked silk, fine cloth and linen from Egypt,¹⁶⁷ and raw silk from Iran.¹⁶⁸ Silk arrived from Baghdad, Tabriz, Nishapur and China.¹⁶⁹ A major aspect of the Anatolian cloth market was the imported western cloths, fine woollen fabrics, camlets, taffeta, Florentine cloth, cloths of Chalons, Champagne, Lombardy, Narbonne, Perpignan, scarlet cloth of Mantua, white damascene, silk brocade, Irish saye, wide English cloth, and cloth of Genoa.¹⁷⁰ Western cloth was much prized and was used as gifts for

158 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 449; Schiltberger, *Bondage*, p. 40.

159 H. İnalcık, ‘The Ottoman Economic Mind and Aspects of the Ottoman Economy’, in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*, ed. M. A. Cook (London, 1970), p. 211.

160 Benedetto Dei, *Dei, La cronica dell’anno 1400 all’anno 1500*, ed. Roberto Barducci (Florence, 1990), p. 141. Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 131–5, describes Bursa as a major market attracting merchants and merchandise from a considerable area. Here all types of silk, rich jewels, pearls, cotton cloth, white cloth, slaves and spices were sold.

161 Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 371. 162 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 418.

163 Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri*, p. 154.

164 Piloti, *L’Égypte*, pp. 60, 61, 73; Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 34, 57–8; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 417; Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 72.

165 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

166 Piloti, *L’Égypte*, pp. 60, 61, 73; Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 34, 57; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 417; Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 72.

167 Piloti, *L’Égypte*, pp. 35, 36; E. Ashtor, *A Social and Economic History of the Near East in the Middle Ages* (London, 1976), p. 262.

168 Piloti, *L’Égypte*, p. 35. 169 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 311. 170 Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 102–6.

visiting Ottoman dignitaries by the Genoese of Pera, the Genoese settlement in Constantinople, in the 1390s.¹⁷¹

With the Turkish conquest of the Aegean coastline and the establishment of beyliks such as Menteşe and Aydın, the ports in these regions, too, became important Turkish markets. Balat, the main port for Menteşe, and Theologos (modern Selçuk), the port of Aydın, served as major import-export ports for the Turkish–European trade, exporting grain and slaves and importing soap, wine and western cloth such as woollens from Florence, cloth of Chalons, Narbonne, Toulouse, Perpignan, and cloths of emerald green, pistache green, azure, turquoise and scarlet.¹⁷² Like Antalya, Theologos also had its own requirements for lengths in which cloth was sold;¹⁷³ and it, too, was a silver market.¹⁷⁴ Other beyliks without a coastal outlet profited from the Mediterranean trade and merchant ships sailed up and down the Büyük Menderes (Meander) from Germiyan to the sea.¹⁷⁵

Ottoman advance into Europe further extended the Turkish market with the conquest of important towns such as Plovdiv (Filibe) and Edirne, the second capital of the empire and a well-populated and important market frequented by many foreign merchants in the 1430s.¹⁷⁶ Goods sold and exported from this region included wool, which was exported from Tekirdağ (Rodosto), Edirne and Gelibolu,¹⁷⁷ and slaves. Gelibolu, taken in 1354, became a major Ottoman slave market, exporting slaves to the Mamluk sultanate and westward across the Mediterranean. Slaves were also sold in other Turkish markets in Rumeli (the European section of the Ottoman Empire) such as Üsküp. It was not just in Rumeli that this was a lively trade. Beyliks along the Aegean coast, Karası, Saruhan, Menteşe and Aydın, had major slave markets. Slaves sold in great numbers on the markets of Saruhan and Karası.¹⁷⁸ It was in the market of Theologos that Ibn Battuta bought a young Christian girl for 40 *dinars* in the early 1330s.¹⁷⁹ Other major slave markets were found in Bursa and in the ports of the south, in Antalya and Alanya from where they were exported across the Mediterranean.

171 1390.iii.31: ASG, San Giorgio 34 n. 590/1304, f. 25v; 1391.xii.19: ASG, Antico Commune 22, ff. 70, 192; 1392.i.16: *ibid.*, ff. 74, 193; 1392.ii.24: *ibid.*, ff. 76, 193; 1392.v.23: *ibid.*, ff. 78, 196; 1392.x.15: *ibid.*, ff. 88, 175.

172 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 55; Piloti, *L'Égypte*, p. 72. 173 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 55.

174 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56. 175 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 354.

176 Bertrand de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 171, 200.

177 Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 80, 82, 126, 202, 238, 348, 396, 491, 586, 615.

178 Demetrius Kydones, *Oratio pro Subsidiis Latinorum*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 154, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1880), cols. 981/982; St. I. Kourouses, *Μανονήλ Γαβαλάς, ἔτα Ματθαῖος μητροπολίτης Ἐρέσον (1271/2–1355/60)* (Athens, 1972), p. 236.

179 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 309.

Together with grain, alum and worked cloth, slaves, either from the region or traded through it, were the major export items from Turkish territories, supplying the Mamluk sultanate in Egypt and providing labour for the Aegean islands, including Cyprus, Crete and Hospitaller-controlled Rhodes. They were sold on the markets in Constantinople, on the Aegean islands, and in the west, in Genoa and Venice. This was a trade in which the Turks took part not merely as traders, both buying and selling, but also as a commodity, for Turkish slaves, too, were sold in the markets of the eastern Mediterranean, in Constantinople, Crete and Chios, and further west in Venice and Genoa.¹⁸⁰ Turks 'and similar sea monsters' appeared in Pisa, and were shipped across the Mediterranean to Spain.¹⁸¹

The Turkish market was assured a constant supply of slaves in consequence of the captives taken both in raiding and in larger-scale battles. Umur of Aydın was particularly renowned for his activities at sea, swooping down on the Latin settlements and sailing off with numerous captives.¹⁸² The islands were vulnerable to Turkish attack and Crete lost population to raids from Menteşe.¹⁸³ The islands of Andros, Paros and Melos were hit by Ottoman forces under Çalı Bey in the early fourteenth century and many of the inhabitants were seized.¹⁸⁴ Constant fighting kept the markets of Karası supplied and specialist slave merchants frequented these markets, living on this type of trade.¹⁸⁵ Warfare and large-scale battles resulted in a glut on the slave market and a consequent fall in prices. As a result of warfare between the Seljuks and Leon of Lesser Armenia, and the Seljuk capture of the castle of Hancın, prices fell on the market at Kayseri, resulting in an extremely beautiful Armenian slave and her female child selling for 50 *dirhems*, a bull and cow for two, and five sheep for only one *dirhem*.¹⁸⁶ The military successes of the Byzantine general Philanthropenos at the end of the thirteenth century resulted in the price of a Turkish slave falling to less than that of a sheep.¹⁸⁷ The battle of Nikopolis in 1396, when the crusader forces were crushed by the Ottoman ruler Bayezid, produced such a

180 Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 42–3.

181 Iris Origo, 'The Domestic Enemy: Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', *Speculum* 30 (1955), 322; Fleet, *Trade*, p. 43.

182 Enveri, *Düşturname-i Enveri*, ed. M. Halil (Istanbul, 1928); Enveri, *Le Destan d'Umür Pacha (Düştürnâme-i Enveri): text, translation et notes*, ed. and tr. I. Mélikoff-Sayar (Paris, 1954); Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 311; Oruç, *Tarihi*, p. 38.

183 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1331M, p. 187, 1358/1359M, pp. 217–18.

184 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 118. 185 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 367.

186 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, p. 57.

187 Planoudes, *Maximi monachi Planudis epistolae*, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), letter 78, p. 99.

glut that no one in Anatolia or Rumeli was left without a slave.¹⁸⁸ The Mamluk sultan Barquq also did well out of this battle for a Turk sent him a present of 200 Christian captives from the battle.¹⁸⁹ Ottoman advance into the Balkans in the 1430s caused prices to fall to such an extent that beautiful young females sold in lots of three for only 100 *akçes* and a four-year-old boy for 20 *akçes* in Üsküp. Aşıkpaşazade himself sold five slaves, whom he had captured, on the market at Üsküp for 900 *akçe* and other captives in Edirne for 100 *akçes* for two, and 100 *akçes* for three slaves.¹⁹⁰

Apart from the Mediterranean ports, the Black Sea ports, too, were important markets, both in the coastal trade between the Byzantine cities of Trebizond (Trabzon) and Constantinople, and in the trade across the Black Sea from Crimea and Russia. Samsun and Sinop were markets for fur, cloth and copper,¹⁹¹ Giresun for alum¹⁹² and merchants travelling to and from the lands of the north frequented Kastamonu and ports such as Sinop.¹⁹³ These ports were also frequented by western merchants, particularly the Genoese and Venetians who had trading settlements in Crimea, Caffa in the case of the Genoese and Tana for the Venetians. The importance of the Black Sea region for the European merchants is indicated by the presence of Genoese consuls in Sinop and Amasra in the early fifteenth century.

All these markets were an important source of revenue for the Turkish rulers in the form of market taxes and import and export dues. According to Simon de Saint-Quentin, Sivas, for example, brought in a lucrative income for the Seljuk sultan.¹⁹⁴ The Seljuks certainly took a healthy interest in taxation from early on. William of Tyre described how Kılıç Arslan I claimed all the region from Tarsus to the Hellespont. Thus 'in the sight of Constantinople itself he had his own procurators who exacted duties from those passing by and collected for the use of their master tributes and taxes from all the surrounding country'.¹⁹⁵ In the fifteenth-century chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade Osman is credited with having established a market tax in Karaca Hisar of two *akçe* for every *yük* brought and sold in the market. Nothing was paid for goods left unsold.¹⁹⁶ Certain commodities attracted specific charges, such as that levied on wheat in Antalya in the fourteenth century of three *aspers* per

188 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 61. 189 Piloti, *L'Égypte*, pp. 109–10.

190 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, pp. 113, 114, 115, 117.

191 Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 14, 27, 88, 206, 306, 307; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, II, p. 784.

192 Léone Liagre, 'Le commerce de l'alun en Flandre au moyen âge', *Le Moyen Âge* 61 (1955), 187.

193 Al-'Umari, 'Voyages', p. 361. 194 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia*, p. 69.

195 William of Tyre, *History*, I, p. 154. 196 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 21.

moggio,¹⁹⁷ two *aspers* per *modio* on grain exported from Mentese, one *asper* per *modio* on barley and dried vegetables, three *aspers* per head for horses, oxen and donkeys at two and slaves at ten, and wine which attracted a special levy of 50 *aspers* per *vegetam de Napoli*.¹⁹⁸ Levies were charged in Aydın in the first half of the fourteenth century on imported wine of one florin per *butam di Napoli* and on imported soap at one florin per *casa*.¹⁹⁹ Other taxes included brokerage and weighing charges such as that levied in Antalya at the rate of one *asper* per *moggio* for wheat.²⁰⁰ Goods were charged for warehousing. That for wheat in Theologos was fixed at 1/5th of a gold *florin* per month per 100 *moggia*.²⁰¹ Warehouse charges could also include transportation from land out to the ship, as was the case in Antalya where the rate of one *asper* per *moggio* of wheat included transportation.²⁰² In Theologos the rate for hiring animals to transport wheat from the city to the sea, a distance of nine *miglia* by land, was 2.5 gold *florins* per 100 *moggia*.²⁰³

A major source of revenue in port cities was customs charges on imports and exports. In Antalya, the Cypriots were charged a rate of 2 per cent.²⁰⁴ In the beylik of Mentese the Venetians paid an import tax of 2 per cent, and 2 per cent also on exports.²⁰⁵ In Aydın in the early years of the fourteenth century there was no import tax but a levy on exports of 4 per cent, except on wax which paid at a rate of 2 per cent.²⁰⁶ By 1337, Venetians in Aydın were being charged an export tax of 6 per cent on all goods which were measured by the *shinik* (presumably meaning grain and pulses) and 4 per cent on all other commodities, such as alum, slaves, horses and wax, though there was still no import tax.²⁰⁷ By the middle of the century Aydın was imposing an import tax of 2 per cent on the Venetians, and exports were charged at 2 per cent (including alum and wax), or 4 per cent in the case of grain, pulses, slaves and animals.²⁰⁸ These were presumably preferential rates. The Genoese, too, along with the Venetians, Arabs and Greeks, paid preferential customs rates on pulses, barley, millet and other grains under the terms of the 1387 treaty

197 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

198 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1331M, p. 187, 1337M, p. 198, 1375M, p. 222, 1403M, doc. 1403M DVL, p. 230, 1407M, p. 236.

199 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.

200 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

201 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.

202 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

203 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.

204 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.

205 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1331M, p. 187, 1337M, p. 198, 1375M, p. 222, 1403M, doc. 1403M DVL, pp. 230–1, 1407M, p. 236.

206 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.

207 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337A, p. 191; for a discussion of the meaning of the term *seruch* see p. 149.

208 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1353A, p. 214.

concluded with Murad I, though the treaty does not specify what the rates were.²⁰⁹ In the treaty concluded in 1403 between Süleyman and the Genoese, the Venetians, the Byzantines and the Hospitallers, the rates to be charged are not given, the clause specifying only that they were to be paid according to custom.²¹⁰ The rate charged in the 1430s in Gelibolu, Edirne and Samsun was 2 per cent.²¹¹

A Turkish economic approach

The economy which emerged under the Turks in the four centuries after the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) was one grounded on the land with significant urban economic activity and a highly active international commercial sphere. Beyond describing the various aspects of the economy which developed, it is interesting to consider whether it is possible to discern any common patterns in the way the various Turkish leaders handled their economy that would constitute what might be termed a Turkish economic approach.

It is obvious that economic motivation drove conquest. Apart from the basic desire for booty, Turkish rulers were interested in taking control of economic assets such as mines, port cities, major markets and trade routes. Commercial considerations were behind the Seljuk expedition to Sudak in Crimea²¹² and the conquest of Antalya, a major Mediterranean port, by the Seljuk ruler Keyhusrev in 1207. In Ibn Bibi's account the conquest was the result of merchant complaints. Merchants had protested to the sultan that returning from Egypt they had gone to Antalya where they had been maltreated by the Franks and their goods seized.²¹³ Economic motivation played a part in the conquest of Constantinople, a city which, although a mere shadow of its former self,²¹⁴ was soon to become once more an international centre of enormous commercial wealth, and was behind Mehmed II's building of Rumeli Hisarı, the castle on the European coast of the Straits opposite Anadolu Hisarı. The location of Rumeli Hisarı allowed Mehmed to control shipping through the Straits and thus to extract customs dues. Any ship attempting not to pay taxes was to be sunk by the efficient and awe-inspiring cannons of Firuz Ağa, the castle's commander.²¹⁵ Ottoman-İsfendiyarogulları rivalry rested at least in part on

209 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2729. doc. 26, published in Fleet, 'Treaty', 15.

210 G. T. Dennis, 'The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 79.

211 Badoer, *Libro*, pp. 87, 89, 114, 181, 253, 306, 352, 353, 384, 462, 491, 496, 640.

212 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, pp. 95-105. 213 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, pp. 36-7, 38.

214 As noted by Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 133.

215 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 199; Tursun Bey, *History*, ff. 35a, 35b; Kritoboulos, *History*, p. 21; Oruç, *Tarihi*, p. 107.

the rich copper mines of the Black Sea region, round Sinop and Kastamonu, which the Ottomans wished to take over.²¹⁶ It was also rivalry over metal resources, this time silver and gold mines, which played a part in the struggle between Murad I and Serbia and Bosnia.²¹⁷ While it is clear that economic motivations drove Turkish conquest, this does not on its own contribute much to a search for a Turkish economic approach, for it is a factor common in essence to all patterns of conquest.

A factor of much greater significance in economic approach, and one which undoubtedly in part accounted for the success of the Turkish conquests, was the Turks' avoidance of economic disruption. Rather than overturning the economy of the regions which they conquered, the Turks tended to leave much of the economic system untouched, thereby guaranteeing minimum opposition from the conquered population and securing continued revenue for the new rulers. The Ottomans, for example, were keen to keep pre-Ottoman taxes in place, converting many from labour services into cash payments and referring to them as customary dues (*rüsum-i urfiyye* or *tekalif-i urfiyye*).²¹⁸ They made no major changes to the system in operation in the mines in the Balkans when they took over the region.²¹⁹ Balkan taxes were adopted by the Ottomans and became the *ispence*, the tax of 25 *akçe* levied on the Christian population in the Balkans, the word originating perhaps in the Slavic *župan*, *županica* or *župnica*, a poll-tax.²²⁰ The *timar* system whereby land was granted in return for military service was possibly related to the Byzantine landholding unit, the *pronoia*,²²¹ though it may also have been derived from the Seljuk *ikta*.²²² The division of land, the *çift*, conformed to the Byzantine *zeugarion*/*jugum*, both representing the amount of land which could be ploughed by a pair of oxen.²²³ Vocabulary, too, came from the Byzantines, such as the word for customs itself, *gümrük*, from the Greek word *komerkion* (Latin

216 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, I, pp. 320, 322, II, pp. 540–2, 574–6; Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, pp. 65, 79–80, 92–3; Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, p. 185.

217 Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, II, p. 212.

218 İnalcık and Quataert, *Economic and Social History*, I, p. 70.

219 Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris*, vol. II: *Règlements miniers 1390–1512* (Paris and La Haye, 1964).

220 P. Wittek, 'Devshirme and Sharī'a', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 17, 2 (1955), 272–3; Dušanica Bojanić-Lukač, 'De la nature et de l'origine de l'ispence', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1976), 24–5; İnalcık, 'ispence', in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Türk Diyanet Vakfı); Osman Turan, 'Selçuklularda Toprak Hukuku. Miri Topraklar ve Hususi Mülkiyet Şekilleri', *Belleten* 12, 47 (1948), 549–74.

221 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 182–3.

222 See chapter 6 in this volume.

223 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 173; İnalcık and Quataert, *Economic and Social History*, I, pp. 143–53.

comerchium). The Ottomans also took much from the Ilkhans, whose coins the early Ottomans imitated and many of whose financial accounting methods they adopted.²²⁴ In the same way as a fluid religious approach and an avoidance of strict orthodoxy smoothed the path of Ottoman conquest and eased the acceptance of new rulers among the Byzantine Orthodox peasantry, so too did the adoption, rather than destruction, of economic systems such as taxation or systems of landholding. The more minimal the element of abrupt change, the less the potential for revolt became. Revenues were not disrupted and the state avoided any need to construct, impose and run new methods of income collection.

As nature abhors a vacuum, so the Turkish economic system in this early period showed an abhorrence of complex structures. This was a further factor in ensuring the success of the new Turkish states and served them well in avoiding instability. A prime example of this is tax farming. Under this system a state auctioned off the collection of a source of revenue, such as customs dues, to an individual or individuals for a lump sum. This ensured the state a fixed income without the need to maintain any form of collection system or to run any risk involved owing to such factors as market fluctuations or, in the case of crops, harvest failure. All such risk in this system fell on the tax farmer who, however, benefited from any successful speculation and reaped the profits from a rising market or boom harvest. This system is often regarded as a backward one for it delivered considerable power into the hands of the tax farmers and abnegated the state's responsibility in an important sector of its economy. It certainly had considerable drawbacks in the later period when tax farmers became in essence uncontrollable semi-independent magnates whose activities in the eighteenth century were severely damaging to the local populations and the state alike. The negative impact of tax farming in the later period does not mean automatically, however, that its use in the early Turkish states of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was a bad thing. In fact, so long as the state was strong and able to control its tax farmers, preventing abusive over-taxation, the economic security it brought to these young states was considerable, ensuring a secure income without the necessity of complex structures for revenue collection, and even, it could be argued, providing a stimulus to commercial activity, for under this system the tax farmers had every incentive to increase production and, in the case of import and export dues, to encourage trade.

224 Said Öztürk, *Osmanlı Arşiv Belgelerinde Siyakat Yazısı ve Tarihi Gelişimi* (İstanbul, 1996), pp. 28–9; Remler, 'Ottoman, İsfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage', pp. 168, 185–8.

Tax farming seems to have been in use among Turkish rulers from early on.²²⁵ In the middle of the thirteenth century control of all alum resources was granted by the Seljuk sultan to two merchants. This resulted, according to William of Rubruck who travelled through Anatolia in this period, in a price 22 per cent higher than it should have been.²²⁶ Whether this was a monopoly or tax farming is unclear from the evidence available, but it seems plausible at least to suggest that tax farming was involved, particularly in view of the high price level. In the following century tax farming was apparently in use in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın and was applied to such goods as alum, wax and hides, textiles, soap and wine, which were placed ‘in appalto’ or ‘in gabella’, terms which seem to mean a tax farm.²²⁷ Tax farming no doubt existed, too, in the early days of the Ottoman state for there is no reason to presume that Ottoman practice in this respect differed from that in the other beyliks of the period. In any case, it certainly seems to have been in operation in the reign of Murad I when Kara Rüstem Paşa was collecting the 25-*akçe* slave tax in Gelibolu,²²⁸ and under Murad II when a tax farmer (*amaldar*) was operating in the same location around 1421.²²⁹

One interesting aspect of tax farming under the early Turkish rulers was the use they made of Latins. Of the two merchants in control of alum in the mid-thirteenth century, one, Nicolao de Santo-Siro, was Genoese, the other, Benefatio de Molendino, Venetian. It seems that foreigners were used by the Ottomans to collect customs revenue and that during the reigns of Murad I and Bayezid I Latin, probably, Genoese, tax farmers were operating in Ottoman ports in this capacity, as indicated by a Venetian document from 1390.²³⁰ The tax farm of alum was held under Mehmed I by the Genoese Giovanni Adorno, who held the same concession for some time under Mehmed’s successor, Murad II.²³¹ Another Genoese, Francesco Draperio, a merchant of considerable consequence close to the Ottoman ruler, tax farmed the alum mines under both Murad II and Mehmed II.²³² The Turkish use of Genoese and

225 Kate Fleet, ‘Tax-farming in the Early Ottoman State’, *The Medieval History Journal* 6, 2 (2003), 249–58.

226 Rubruck, *Mission*, p. 273.

227 Elizabeth Zachariadou (*Trade and Crusade*, pp. 134–5) has taken these terms to mean a monopoly but it seems more likely that they in fact mean a tax farm. See Kate Fleet, ‘Appalto and Gabella: Farmed Tax or Monopoly?’, *Eurasian Studies* 2, 1 (2003), 31–42.

228 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 50; Oruç, *Tarihi*, pp. 41–2. 229 Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, p. 88.

230 J. Chrysostomides, *Monumenta Peloponnesica* (Camberley, 1995), no. 68, p. 138. See also Fleet, *Trade*, pp. 134–5.

231 Doukas, *Decline*, pp. 150–1, 158; Aşıkpaşazade, *Chronik*, bab. 87, p. 88.

232 1449.iv.1: ASG, Notai Antichi, f. 11; Philip R. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the Island, 1346–1566*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1958), III, no. 222, pp. 658–9.

Venetian tax farmers is a further example of the fluidity and pragmatism of early Turkish economic policy. Keen to benefit from a highly lucrative market, Latin merchants were willing to invest money, and expertise, in the Turkish economy and the Turks were willing to benefit from it in what proved to be, particularly in the case of the Ottomans and the Genoese, a symbiotic relationship of mutual benefit.

The Turkish rulers, while adopting much that they found and benefiting from the Latins operating in their territories, were also both active promoters of economic activity and traders in their own right. They did much to promote economic prosperity, essential to the survival and success of their states. They took measures to ensure that land was not left uncultivated, making certain that peasants stayed on the land, either through persuasion or population transfers, an approach they also adopted towards the towns. They secured a vibrant economically active population for their cities. The Seljuk ruler settled rich merchants in the recently conquered ports of Antalya and Sinop to ensure the development of trade.²³³ Kılıç Arslan II, when establishing the town of Aksaray, settled merchants there to maintain its prosperity.²³⁴ Mehmed II enforced the movement of artisans into the newly conquered city of Constantinople.

Keen to facilitate trade in their territories the Seljuks in particular built caravansaries to provide shelter and security for merchants and their goods. Such caravansaries were set up on the major east–west and north–south international trade routes, bringing goods from Egypt and Syria to Antalya and Alanya and crossing through Konya, Sivas and Erzurum and on to Iran, or to Sinop and Samsun and from there across the Black Sea to Crimea, or running across Anatolia through Konya and Akşehir westwards to Constantinople and Anatolia.²³⁵ The first caravansary was built in the reign of Kılıç Arslan II near Aksaray.²³⁶ Others were built in the fourteenth century.²³⁷ Such caravansaries were important for the security of both merchants and merchandise, and for providing everything a traveller might need: a place to sleep, food, depots for goods, stables, fodder for their animals, *hamams*, *mescids*, hospitals, even blacksmiths and cobblers. They were staffed by officials who dealt with the

233 Osman Turan, 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', *Belleten* 10, 39 (1946), 473.

234 Turan, 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', 476.

235 Bertrand de la Broquière, *Voyage*, stayed in a very beautiful caravansary near Karahisar (p. 123), and in one in Kütahya (p. 128); Pegolotti visited two (identified by Osman Turan as those of Karatay and Keykuban, 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', p. 53), *Pratica*, p. 39; Ibn Bibi mentions several, *Selçuknâme*, pp. 73 (Pervane Kervansarayı near Aksaray), p. 82 (Lale Kervansarayı), p. 132 (Ahmed-i raht Kervansarayı), p. 199 (Kervansaray-ı Sultan), p. 223 (Kervansaray-ı Altunba), p. 234 (Kervansaray-ı Karatay); Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri*, p. 274.

236 Turan, 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', p. 476.

237 See chapter 8 in this volume.

administration and with the income and expenditure.²³⁸ Apart from ensuring the economic activity of major routes and towns, caravansaries also made the region round them a centre of trade.²³⁹ *Zaviyes* and *hanekahs* (dervish lodges), which were so abundant when Ibn Battuta travelled through Anatolia, served in many ways as caravansaries did for travellers, though on a smaller scale.²⁴⁰ In the towns the Turkish rulers built *bedestans* and *hans* (caravansaries), commercial buildings in which merchants lived, traded and stored their goods, such as the Bey Han of Orhan, or Geyve Han and İpek Han built by Mehmed I,²⁴¹ and the *bedestan* with shops round it built by Mehmed I in Edirne.²⁴²

The Turks were themselves active merchants, trading not just within their own territories but also within the Byzantine Empire, in Constantinople, in Syria and in the Black Sea and Crimea, as they did under the Seljuks,²⁴³ and on the islands in the Aegean. At the end of the twelfth century merchants from Konya were trading in Constantinople.²⁴⁴ In the early fifteenth century Turks traded in Chios. In 1414 a Turk, Sipahi Bayezid, was trading grain with Domenico Balbi on Chios,²⁴⁵ a trade in which Cüneyd Bey, the then ruler of Aydın, was also involved as he too sold grain to Chios.²⁴⁶ Turks were also apparently trading copper there in this period.²⁴⁷ Bayezid I's demand for the right to sell slaves in Rhodes without any restrictions indicates that Turks were trading slaves there in the late fourteenth century.²⁴⁸ It was Bayezid who insisted on the establishment of a *kadı* in Constantinople to protect the interests of Turkish merchants trading there.²⁴⁹ That Turkish merchants were active in Pera in this period is supported by the statement issued by the Genoese authorities in 1402 urging any Turks with complaints against former Genoese

238 See, for example, the *vakıf* for the Karatay Kervansarayı, Osman Turan, 'Selçuk Devri Vakfiyeleri III: Celaleddin Karatay Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', *Belleten* 12, 45 (1948), 17–70.

239 Turan, 'Selçuk Devri Vakfiyeleri III', pp. 63–4.

240 Turan, 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', pp. 479, 492.

241 See chapter 8 in this volume; Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkibeleri*, pp. 125, 131, refers to Şekerfuruşan (Şekerciler) Hanı.

242 Oruç, *Tarihi*, p. 71. A great fire in 849 (1445–6) reduced the *bedestan* in Edirne to ashes; Oruç, *Tarihi*, p. 97.

243 Choniates, *Annals*, pp. 272, 291; Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, p. 98; Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkibeleri*, pp. 158, 243.

244 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 272.

245 1414.vii.16: ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filze I, doc. 311, published in Fleet, *Trade*, Appendix 5, doc. 12, pp. 173–4.

246 1414.iii.18: ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filze I, doc. 288, published in Fleet, *Trade*, Appendix 5, doc. 10, pp. 171–2.

247 1404.xii.31: ASG, Notaio Gregorio Panissario, Sc. 37, filze I, doc. 48; Toniolo, *Notai Genovesi*, doc. 52, p. 105.

248 Luttrell, 'Hospitaliers', pp. 96–7.

249 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 81. A *kadı* was installed by Emperor John VII, then acting as regent; *ibid.*, p. 87.

officials to come forward as part of the investigation into the conduct of Ettore di Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano who were being tried for corruption.²⁵⁰ There were very close relations between the Turks and the Genoese of Pera, according to Bertrandon de la Broquière, who remarked that the Turks were quite at home there.²⁵¹ Turks were also trading in Syria in the same period, for Bertrandon de la Broquière travelled with four Turkish merchants from Hama to Aleppo, and in Constantinople,²⁵² and there were Turks in Constantinople at the time when Mehmed II was building Rumeli Hisarı.²⁵³

As Bayezid's actions over a *kadı* in Constantinople show, Turkish rulers took care to protect their merchants. When merchants complained to Alaeddin Keykubad about losses they had sustained because of attacks in the Caspian Sea, in Lesser Armenia and at sea when attacked by the Franks (an incident in which the merchant concerned was enslaved), the sultan was upset and ordered them compensated for their losses, announcing that it was necessary to send troops against those who harmed the merchants of the land.²⁵⁴ Keyhusrev took the same approach. In response to Alexios Angelos's imprisonment of Turkish merchants from Konya and the seizure of their goods, which were then redistributed to others, he launched a surprise attack on the towns of Karia and Tantalos, along the Meander river (Büyük Menderes), enslaving all those 'who were in the prime of life', and plundering many other cities before moving on into Phrygia.²⁵⁵ It was again the behaviour of the Byzantine emperor Alexios Angelos which prompted the Seljuk sultan Rükneddin into action in order to protect Turkish merchants from Byzantine aggression. Constantine Frangopoulos, under instructions from the emperor, spent several months attacking merchantmen in the Black Sea with his fleet of six triremes. Seizing merchants' goods and money, he killed some and stripped others, leaving them 'as naked as a pestle'.²⁵⁶ Making their way to Constantinople, the surviving merchants appealed to an uninterested emperor. The merchants of Konya then turned to Rükneddin who responded by sending envoys to the emperor and demanding the return of the merchants' monies. An agreement was reached

250 1402.x.30: ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590/1306, f. 14r. For this corruption case, see Kate Fleet, 'Corruption and Justice: the Case of Ettore di Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 275–90.

251 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, p. 141.

252 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage*, pp. 81, 164–5.

253 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 198. 254 Ibn Bibi, *Selçuknâme*, p. 98.

255 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 272. 256 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 291.

and Rükneddin received 50 *minae* of silver as compensation for the losses in addition to the annual tribute.²⁵⁷ Turkish rulers were also concerned to protect their agents. Murad I's desire to protect his own interests and those of his commercial agent, Giovanni Demerode, acting for him in Constantinople, who had been over-taxed by Byzantine officials, is evident in the clauses of the treaty between him and the Genoese enacted in June 1387.²⁵⁸

As has been noted earlier, there was a particularly close relationship between the Ottomans and the Genoese, the Ottoman rulers Orhan and Murad I employing Genoese agents, for example, Orhan using Filippo Demerode and Bonifacio da Sori,²⁵⁹ and Murad Filippo's brother Giovanni.²⁶⁰ This attitude, evident also in the level of diplomatic to-ing and fro-ing between the Genoese in Pera and the Ottoman court in the 1390s,²⁶¹ did not just apply to the Ottomans and the Genoese for all Turkish rulers were keen to attract foreign merchants, European, Iranian or Mamluk, into their domains. It was economic interests which largely drove their diplomatic relations, and treaties between the Turks and various western states were in essence commercial agreements. The Seljuk treaties with Venice and those concluded by the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın with Venice between 1331 and 1414 consisted largely of clauses concerning rates and trading practices, as did that between Aydın and the Santa Unio in 1348. The treaty drawn up between the Ottomans and the Genoese in 1387 was again very much a commercial agreement.²⁶² Other Ottoman–Genoese treaties, that enacted between Orhan and the doge in the winter of 1351–2²⁶³ and that negotiated with Bayezid I in 1389,²⁶⁴ are apparently no longer extant, but can be presumed also to have been commercial in nature. The beylik of Saruhan concluded a treaty with the Genoese Giovanni Giustiniano and Francesco Giustiniano, partners in the Maona of Chios, probably in the

257 Choniates, *Annals*, p. 290.

258 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2729, doc. 26, published in Fleet, 'Treaty', 14.

259 1356.iii.21: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, f. 304v, published in L. T. Belgrano, 'Documenti riguardanti la colonia genovese di Pera', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia della Patria* 13 (1877–84), no. 17, pp. 125–6.

260 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2729, doc. 26; Fleet, 'Treaty', 14.

261 References to such contacts appear in the account books of the Genoese comune of Pera; ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1304; ASG, Antico Comune 22.

262 1387.vi.8: ASG: Archivio Segreto 2729, doc. 26; Fleet, 'Treaty'.

263 1358.xi.20: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, f. 304r; Belgrano, 'Documenti', no. 21, p. 129; Kantakouzenos, *Ioannes Kantakouzenos, Historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1828–32), III, p. 288; Gregoras, *Historia*, III, p. 84.

264 1389.x.26: ASG, Not. c. 476, Donato de Clavaro, doc. 10, published in Fleet, *Trade*, Appendix 5, doc. 2, pp. 157–8. A summary is given in Balard *et al.*, no. 66, p. 33.

late 1340s,²⁶⁵ and Aydın with Genoa in 1351.²⁶⁶ The Ottomans also concluded treaties with the Venetians, the Venetian ambassador Daniel Corner arriving to negotiate a treaty with Murad I in 1387²⁶⁷ and Francesco Querini with Bayezid I in 1390.²⁶⁸

Such treaties offered various commercial concessions and inducements to the western traders who represented considerable profits for the state from extensive import and export trade, customs revenues and other related taxes. Reduced customs rates were charged for favoured 'nations', the Seljuks granting the Venetians a reduced customs tax of 2 per cent²⁶⁹ and the Ottomans giving a concessionary rate to the Genoese, Venetians and Arab merchants in 1387.²⁷⁰ Apart from tax reductions, other concessions were also granted such as exemption from customs charges on grain, precious stones, gold and silver conceded to the Venetians under the Seljuk–Venetian treaty of 1220.²⁷¹ In the early fourteenth century merchants paid no import duties in Altoluogo (except on soap and wine).²⁷² The right of foreign merchants to trade safely in Turkish territory was safeguarded. On occasion the foreign trading community was given land, or a church, the church of S. Nicola being given to the Venetians by the emir of Menteşe in 1337, for example.²⁷³ The Venetian and Genoese trading communities were granted extra-territorial legal privileges in Turkish territory for their affairs were handled by their own consuls. The Venetians had consuls in Aydın from 1337 and in Menteşe from possibly as early as 1318.²⁷⁴ Such consuls had considerable powers both in cases involving only their own nationals, in which they had the right to impose punishment up to and including the death penalty, and in cases involving a Turkish plaintiff or a Turkish defendant.²⁷⁵

Commercial concessions were by no means restricted to the Turkish side in an unequal partnership, for just as the presence of merchants was important to Turkish rulers, so the Turkish territories were important to the

265 1364.x.8: ASG, Not. Ig. xviii, 14. 266 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 58.

267 Chrysostomides, *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca*, doc. 35, pp. 81–4.

268 Chrysostomides, *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca*, doc. 68, pp. 137–41.

269 1220.iii.8: Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, no. 258, p. 222.

270 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segretto 2729, no. 26; Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 5, p. 15.

271 1220.iii.8: Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, no. 258, p. 222.

272 Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337A, p. 191.

273 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337M, p. 187, 1375M, p. 221; see also 1337A, p. 191.

274 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 137, 1337A, pp. 191–2.

275 Kate Fleet, 'Turkish–Latin Diplomatic Relations in the 14th Century: the Case of the Consul', in *The Ottoman Capitulations: Text and Context*, ed. Maurits H. van den Boogert and Kate Fleet, *Oriente Moderno* 22, 3 (2003), 605–11.

foreign traders for whom they represented a hugely important commercial prospect. The European states were equally anxious to negotiate treaties. The Genoese certainly were. Simon Bocanegra, the doge of Genoa, regarded the treaty with Orhan concluded in the winter of 1351–2, for example, as most advantageous to Genoese interests,²⁷⁶ and it is clear that the Genoese government was keen to maintain good relations with Aydın in the same period.²⁷⁷

Just as the Turkish rulers were ready to offer concessions to attract merchants into their territories, so, too, were the western states willing to make concessions in order to gain access to the lucrative Turkish market. They were prepared to pay tribute, as the Genoese of New Phokaea (Foça) did to Saruhan in return for freedom to trade.²⁷⁸ They were also ready to grant tax concessions in their own territories. When Orhan wrote in March 1356 to the Genoese requesting tax concessions for his agents, Filippo Demerode and Bonifacio da Sori, the Genoese government agreed despite the damage this represented to Genoese interests. In his letter to the Genoese authorities in Pera instructing them to grant these concessions, the *locumtenente* noted drily, ‘he who does not suffer in giving, does not receive that which he wishes’. In this case the suffering was worth the anticipated return.²⁷⁹ The 1387 Ottoman–Genoese treaty gave Turkish merchants in Pera exemption from payment of *commercium*.²⁸⁰

Aware of their economic strength, the Turks controlled and manipulated the market, fixed prices, banned exports and imposed monopolies. In 1384 the Venetians were forced to negotiate the price of alum, which they wished to bring down.²⁸¹ Wine was made a monopoly item by the rulers of Aydın and Menteşe.²⁸² The Ottomans banned the export of key commodities, such as grain, the export of which was forbidden by Bayezid I in 1390.²⁸³ In the

276 1356.iii.21: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, f. 304r.

277 1351.v.26: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2727, doc. 43, f. 1v. The document refers to the ruler of Aydın’s known goodwill towards the Genoese, to whom he had offered all possible help in his letters.

278 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 149.

279 1356.iii.21: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, ff. 304v–305r, published in Belgrano, ‘Documenti’, no. 18, pp. 126–7: ‘solet chi no da de zo che dol no ha de zo che vol’.

280 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto, Materie Politiche 2729, doc. 26; Fleet, ‘Treaty’, p. 14.

281 Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium*, II, no. 116, p. 194.

282 Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 171, 1331M, pp. 188–9.

283 Doukas, *Decline*, p. 81; Chrysostomides, *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca*, doc. 68, p. 138, n. 2; Kate Fleet, ‘Ottoman Grain Exports from Western Anatolia at the End of the Fourteenth Century’, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 40, 3 (1997), 283–93; Freddy

aftermath of King Peter of Cyprus's attack on Alexandria in 1365, the export of horses to the Hospitallers was banned.²⁸⁴ Aydın imposed a ban on the export of timber, cereals and horses, forcing the Venetians to send an ambassador in 1400 to investigate the possibilities of this prohibition being removed.²⁸⁵ Professor İnalcık has argued that the Ottoman policy of prohibiting the export of grain and other raw materials, such as cotton, raw wool and hides, 'was pursued with the purpose of preventing shortages in necessities for the masses'.²⁸⁶ This does not, however, seem to be the case here, at least with Bayezid's ban in 1390 or that on grain export in 1400, but is more related to the considerable power of the Ottomans at this point when they were doing particularly well and Bayezid's siege of Constantinople had forced up the price of grain.²⁸⁷ Nor does it appear to be related to any great dearth in the region, for it seems that at least in 1392 there was no problem with the harvests.²⁸⁸ It certainly does not seem to be the case for the export of horses, and in the example of the Hospitallers is politically motivated. There was also some form of control over the export of alum for in 1384 Venice instructed its ambassador to Murad I to try and ensure that Venetian merchants could load and export the commodity from Ottoman territory.²⁸⁹

In conclusion, therefore, it can be argued that there was a Turkish economic approach which was essentially pragmatic and laissez-faire, motivated by a desire to avoid economic disruption, a willingness to adopt rather than change economic systems which were already in place, and an avoidance of complex structures, as well as a proactive engagement involving active promotion of economic development, both rural and urban, protection of merchants, both local and foreign, cultivation of commercial relations, in particular with the west, and manipulation of the market.

By the early fourteenth century, the land of Anatolia into which the Turks had first moved towards the end of the eleventh century was described by Ibn Battuta in glowing terms: 'This country called Bilad al-Rum [i.e. Anatolia] is

Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII–XV siècles)* (Paris, 1975), p. 364.

284 Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', p. 113.

285 Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, doc. 988, p. 12; Noiret, *Documents*, pp. 110–11; Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, p. 102.

286 İnalcık and Quataert, *Economic and Social History*, I, p. 49.

287 The siege forced the price up to more than twenty gold coins per measure of grain; Doukas, *Decline*, p. 86; Paola Massa, 'Alcune lettere mercantile toscane da colonie genovesi alla fine del trecento', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia della Patria*, n.s., II, fasc. II (1971), no. 2, p. 357.

288 Massa, 'Lettere', no. 1, p. 356.

289 Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium*, II, no. 116, p. 194.

one of the finest regions in the world, in it God has brought together the good things dispersed through other lands. Its inhabitants are the comeliest of men in form, the cleanest in dress, the most delicious in food, and the kindest of God's creatures'.²⁹⁰ By 1453 the Ottoman Empire had emerged as one of the great commercial empires of the period, a Mediterranean power with an economy of enormous power and wealth.

²⁹⁰ Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, p. 415.

Art and architecture, 1300–1453

HOWARD CRANE

The century and a half between the disappearance of the Seljuk dynasty in Anatolia at the beginning of the fourteenth century and the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453 is a period in which Turkish art and architecture underwent a significant transformation. It is a time when, on the one hand, forms, functions, vocabularies and techniques which defined Rum Seljuk art and architecture continued to flourish in the towns of the central and eastern Anatolia, while on the other, striking departures from that tradition, drawing on diverse sources, including late Byzantine, Timurid and Mamluk art, manifest themselves, in particular in the Turkish border lands of western Asia Minor. In part, no doubt, the artistic ferment and change of the period are related to the decentralisation of political authority that characterises Anatolia throughout the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Because of this political division, the centralised patronage of the Rum Seljuks, which had produced a more or less homogeneous period style in the thirteenth century, was replaced by a patronage dispersed throughout a constellation of small principalities, the rulers of which often sought to enhance their prestige and legitimacy through ambitious building programmes. The result, not surprisingly, was the proliferation of regional centres of architectural activity, and with this the emergence of a number of more or less distinctive regional styles.

The Turkish conquest of the *uc*, the southern and western borderlands of Anatolia in which, through careful cultivation of resources, the Laskarids had been able to revive Byzantine administration and culture during the time of the Nicaean Empire, gave rise to sometimes striking syncretisms of Seljuk and Byzantine traditions. With regard to the visual arts, these manifested themselves not only in terms of technique, but on occasion, in terms of formal and ornamental vocabularies as well. At the same time, Mamluk influence can be felt in southern Anatolia in decorative vocabularies and techniques as well as occasionally in planning, while in the early years of the fifteenth century, the cultural splendours of Timurid Samarkand and Herat were reflected in the

architecture and decorative arts of Bursa and Edirne, where Iranian craftsmen laboured in the service of the Ottoman sultans. In time this interchange gave birth to a new imperial Turkish art and architecture, one consciously formulated and promoted by Sultan Mehmed II and made manifest in the Ottoman monuments and decorative arts of the decades following the conquest of Constantinople in 1453.

Among the decorative arts it is ceramics, carpets and woodworking that are best represented. A scattering of textiles and objects in metal plus a handful of illuminated and illustrated manuscripts are known as well, but serve only to hint at the existence of *œuvres* that are today largely lost. Architecture, on the other hand, is documented by an extensive corpus of monuments which survive not only in the old Seljuk heartland of central Anatolia, but in even greater numbers in what were the Turkoman principalities of the west Anatolian marches and in the south-eastern Balkans. While aspects of this material have been dealt with in a fairly extensive body of literature, it has yet to form in and of itself the subject of a systematic independent study.

Centres of architectural activity and town planning

The gradual decay of the Seljuk sultanate of Konya following the Mongol victory at Köseadağ in 1243, the imposition of the Mongol protectorate over central and eastern Anatolia and the breakdown of central authority over the Turkoman beys of the march lands of southern and western Anatolia gave rise, beginning in the latter years of the thirteenth century, to a series of more or less ephemeral principalities (*beyliks*) in the western Taurus, the Aegean hinterland and the Black Sea littoral. Already in the 1250s the Karamanids make their appearance in Issuria and a decade or two later the Eşrefoğlu are mentioned in the region of Beyşehir. In western Anatolia, Germiyan centred on Kütahya began severing its links with the Seljuks after the execution of Sultan Mesud III in 1283, while along the coasts there gradually came into existence a series of Turkoman principalities – Hamid, Teke, Menteşe, Aydın, Karası, Osman, Candar – some of them on territories which had slipped from Seljuk control, others in areas newly carved out of the Byzantine sphere. In central and eastern Anatolia, the enfeeblement and eventual extinction of the Seljuk sultanate was paralleled by the emergence of an increasingly direct Ilkhanid administration and, after the death of Abu Sa'id Khudabanda in 1335, by the creation on the part of the last Mongol governor, Eretna, of an independent state based on Kayseri, Sivas and Tokat. Here Seljuk-Mongol traditions enjoyed a considerable continuity down to the end of the fourteenth

century. The far eastern region of Anatolia, on the other hand, was a zone of powerfully conflicting ambitions and fluid frontiers, the major players in which were rival Turkoman confederations – the Dulğadıroğlu, Karakoyunlu and Akkoyunlu – and behind them competing outside powers such as the Jalayrids, the Mamluks and later the Ottomans.

It should come as no surprise that in this fragmented political environment, with its complex and shifting mosaic of competing principalities, architectural styles, planning and patronage should, from region to region, have manifested quite varied tendencies. It is further apparent that patronage and building activities were intimately linked to the shifting economic and political fortunes of the principalities and regions with which they were associated. Epigraphy suggests that by the last two decades of the thirteenth century architectural activity had come virtually to a halt in the towns of the old Seljuk heartland such as Konya, Kayseri and Sivas and that this hiatus continued into the early decades of the fourteenth century, when the region was under direct Ilkhanid rule.¹ The fortress town of Niğde at the northern end of the Taurus passes, on the other hand, was enriched by a pair of quite outstanding monuments in the early fourteenth century, a mosque built by the Mongol emir Sungur Bey and the tomb of Hüdavend Hatun, a daughter of the Seljuk sultan Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV, who was in all likelihood married to a local Mongol emir. Likewise Tokat and Amasya seem to have enjoyed moments of prosperity under Ilkhanid rule, for epigraphy commemorates the foundation of a mosque, a *tekke* (dervish lodge) and a pair of tombs in the former and the construction of a monumental hospital as well as a pair of mosques in the latter, while to the east, in Erzurum, the first two decades of the fourteenth century witnessed the construction of several noteworthy monuments, most outstandingly Yakutiye Medrese of 710/1310.² One is left, then, with the impression of impoverishment and exhaustion in the towns of the old Seljuk heartland, contrasting with a perhaps modest prosperity in the towns along the trade route to Tabriz.

1 For construction and restoration texts and epitaphs which can be used to date tombs in Konya, see *Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe* (Cairo, 1931) [henceforth RCEA], nos. 4826, 4861, 4862, 4905, 4906; for Kayseri, RCEA, 4840; for Sivas, RCEA, 5152, 5489.

2 See for Niğde, RCEA, 5308 (which mentions the name of Abu Sa'id) and 5693; for Tokat, RCEA, 4789, 4903, 4959, 4960, 5114, 5178, 5326, 5390. For the construction text of the Bimarhane of Amasya (giving the names of the Ilkhan Öljeitü and his spouse Yıldız Hatun), see RCEA, 5238; for other Amasya inscriptions, RCEA, 5461, 5611. For the construction text and *vakfiye* of the Yakutiye Medrese of Erzurum, which again mention Öljeitü and state that it was founded during his reign using the surplus revenues of Sultan Ghazan and Bulghan Hatun, see RCEA, 5276, 5277; for lesser monuments in Erzurum, see RCEA, 5239, 5350.

While architectural activity was at a low ebb in the zone of direct Mongol control, new centres of patronage began to appear in the Turkoman principalities of the western Taurus and the Aegean hinterland. Already at the end of the thirteenth century the Karamanoğlu and Eşrefoğlu were engaged in ambitious building programmes in the main towns of their newly independent states. At Beyşehir in 687/1288 the Eşrefoğlu emir Seyfeddin Süleyman renovated the town walls, no doubt in part to assert his independence, although the inscription on his citadel gate still recognises the suzerainty of the Seljuk sultan Gıyaseddin Mesud II, and this was followed a decade later by the construction of a royal mosque and tomb complex. Meanwhile, in the Taurus uplands, a dynastic mausoleum was built in the village of Balkasun by Karamanoğlu Mahmud Bey for his father, Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, and a few years later Mahmud Bey founded a large if unpretentious dynastic mosque in his capital at Ermenak. Within a generation, the centre of Karamanid architectural activity had shifted to the north, to what had become their new capital, Larende (Karaman), where throughout the remainder of the fourteenth and much of the fifteenth century a succession of important monuments were erected, including the Emir Musa Paşa Medresesi (c.1350), the Mader-i Mevlana Zaviyesi (772/1370), the Hatuniye Medresesi (783/1381–2), the tomb of Karamanoğlu Alaeddin Bey (c.1388), the Halil Efendi Sultan complex (812/1409–10) and the İbrahim Bey İmareti (836/1432). Secondary centres of Karamanid architectural activity developed in the other important towns of the principality, including Konya, Niğde, Akşehir, Mut and Ereğli.³

In south-western Anatolia and along the Black Sea shore, as Germiyan and Hamid broke their links to the Seljuks in the last decades of the thirteenth century, and, as a series of new principalities – Menteşe, Aydın, Saruhan, Karası, İsfendiyar – came into existence in what had been Byzantine territory, fresh architectural activity manifested itself in the key towns of these states. Thus, in Pisidia and Pamphylia, in the beylik of Hamid, Eğridir, Korkudeli and Antalya became noteworthy centres of building activity, while in the principality of

3 For the Beyşehir inscriptions, see RCEA, 4907, 5037, 5082, 5083, 5140; for the inscription of the Balkasun tomb, which contains the graves of Mahmud Bey and Mehmed Bey in addition to that of Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, see RCEA, 4489 (in which the Seljuk sultan Mesud II ibn Keykavus is mentioned as sovereign, indicating at least nominal Karamanid vassalage) and RCEA, 5154. For the Larende (Karaman) monuments, see RCEA, 4817, 5347, 772–010, 772–011, 783–014, and İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Karaman Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1967); for Karamanid Konya, RCEA, 5638 and Mehmet Önder, *Mevlana Şehri Konya* (Ankara, 1971), pp. 209, 211, 212, 215, 218–9, 222, 311; for Niğde, see Albert Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1932–4) [henceforth MTA], 1: *Kayseri – Niğde*, pp. 133, 141, 148, 149; for Akşehir, RCEA, 5713, 5729; for Mut, see Mehlika Arel, 'Mut'taki Karamanoğulları Devri Eserleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 5 (1962), 241–50.

Germiyan, the prosperity of Kütahya is attested by the construction of the Vacidiye Medrese in the early years of the fourteenth century and later by the founding of a series of mosques – the Kurşunlu Camii, the Balıklı Cami, the Kale-i Bala Camii, the Çatal Mescid – in the reign of Süleyman Şah.⁴ In Caria, on the south-west coast of Anatolia, the Turkoman of Menteşe, already present in that country as early as the 1260s, embellished their capitals, Milas and the nearby Peçin, with a series of fine buildings. Ibn Battuta describes them as among the finest and most extensive cities of Rum and singles out Menteşeoğlu Orhan Bey's new palace in Peçin, its congregational mosque and other buildings for special mention.⁵

Further north in the emirate of Aydın, the towns of Birgi, Tire and Ayasoluk (Ephesus) became centres of architectural activity in the fourteenth century. Birgi, which was occupied by Gazi Mehmed Bey in 707/1307–8, was embellished with his state mosque – the Ulu Cami (712/1312–13) – his *medrese* (school) and a series of dynastic tombs including those of Mehmed Bey himself (734/1334), of his sons Gazi Umur Paşa and İsa Bey, and of his sister Sultan Şah Hatun (710/1310). In Tire, which is described by Ibn Battuta as being a fine town of streams and gardens, notable monuments included the now ruined mosque of İsa Bey's daughter Hafsa Hatun (mid-fourteenth century), the Aydınoğlu Mehmed Bey Camii (c.727/1326–7) and the tomb of Süleyman Şah ibn Gazi Mehmed Bey (750/1349–50), who was appointed governor of Tire by his father. Ayasoluk, which suffered considerable decline in the last period of Byzantine rule, underwent a striking revival under the beys of Aydın. Ibn Battuta states that it had fifteen gates and that a large church (presumably the Church of St John) had been converted into the town's congregational mosque. The importance of the town is reflected in an even more substantial way by the congregational mosque (776/1375) built by İsa b. Mehmed Bey, one of the most impressive monuments of the period of the emirates to survive in western Anatolia.⁶

4 For the Germiyanid monuments and foundation texts of Kütahya, see RCEA, 5346; Mustafa Çetin Varlık, *Germiyan-Oğulları Tarihi* (1300–1429) (Ankara, 1974), pp. 137–40; also A. Sayılı, 'The Wâjidiyya Madrasa of Kütahya', *Belleten* 12, 48 (1948), 667–77.

5 For the Menteşeid inscriptions of Milas and Peçin, see Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.–14. Jh.* (Istanbul, 1934), pp. 134–56; for Peçin, Ayda Arel, 'Peçin, a Capital of the Principality of Menteşe,' *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 1 (1968), 69–102. For Ibn Battuta's comments on Peçin see *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, A. D. 1325–1354, ed. and tr. H. A. R. Gibb, 4 vols. (London, 1962), II, pp. 428–9.

6 A full list of the monuments of the principality as attested by inscriptions and by archival documents is given in Himmet Akın, *Aydınoğulları Tarihi Hakkında bir Araştırma* (Ankara, 1968), pp. 216–20; see also N. Emre, 'Aydınoğulları ve Eserleri', *Arktekt* 10–12 (1973), 307–20. Of the monuments of Birgi, the tombs of Gazi Umur Paşa and İsa Bey are no longer

The beys of the principality of Saruhan in the rich Gediz plain embellished their capital, Manisa, in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, to which its İlyas Bey Mescidi (764/1363), the far more impressive Ulu Cami complex (778/1376) including a mosque, a *medrese* and the tomb of Saruhanoglu İshak Bey, and a no longer extant *zaviye*, the Mevlevihane (770/1368–9) on the slopes of Mount Sipylus, all date. That the town continued to retain its importance into Ottoman times is clear from the fact that it was the residence of several Ottoman princes during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁷

The emirs of the short-lived principality of Karası made Balıkesir and Bergama their capitals, but little remains in either from the period of their independence. Indeed, Ibn Battuta describes Bergama as a city in ruin, and notes that although Balıkesir was a populous city with pleasant bazaars, there was no congregational mosque for Friday prayers, one having been begun, but left unfinished at the time of his visit.⁸ Along the Black Sea coast, however, the principality of İsfendiyar, centred on the towns of Kastamonu and Sinop, was a region of rather more notable building activity. A number of important fourteenth-century foundations survive in Kastamonu and in nearby villages, including the İbni Neccar Camii (754/1353), the Halil Bey Camii (765/1363–4) of Kemah Köyü and the Mahmud Bey Camii (768/1366–7) of Kasaba Köyü. Although construction seems to have petered out in the last decades of the fourteenth century, there appears to have been a revival of activity after Timur's restoration of the principality in the early fifteenth century. The most impressive monuments of this late period are the İsmail Bey complex, consisting of a mosque, tomb (858/1454), *medrese*, *imaret* (soup kitchen), *han* (caravansary) and *hamam*, and the İsmail Bey Camii (855/1451) in the nearby Kürei Hadit Köyü. Sinop, further to the east along the Black Sea coast, served throughout the period as an important commercial and naval base. Annexed by İsfendiyar in 1322, its importance is attested by the construction of a series of mosques – the Fatih Baba Mescidi (740/1339–40), Aslan Camii (752/1351–2), Kadı Camii

extant. For the inscriptions, see RCEA, 5272, 5310, 5311, 5474, 5657. For the monuments of Tire, see İnci Aslanoğlu, *Tire'de Camiler ve Üç Mescit* (Ankara, 1978); also RCEA, 5783, 5784, 6135, 774–012, 782–005. For the İsa Bey Camii, see K. Otto-Dorn, 'Die İsa Bey Moschee in Ephesus', *Istanbuler Forschungen* 17 (1950), 115–31; also M. Şeker, *Selçuk İsa Bey Camii* (İzmir, 1970); inscription, RCEA, 776–013. For Tire, Birgi and Aydın, see also Rudolf M. Riefstahl, *Turkish Architecture in Southwest Anatolia* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. 32–8; Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, pp. 438–47.

7 For the Ulu Cami complex, see Riefstahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, pp. 7–15; for the İshak Çelebi Mevlevihane, see Semavi Eyice, 'İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini-İçtimai bir Müessesesi: Zâviyeler ve Zâviyeli-Camiler', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 21, 1–2 (1962–3), 65; also Godfrey Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture* (Baltimore, 1971), p. 42. For inscriptions, RCEA, 764–031, 768–006, 770–026, 780–004. Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, pp. 447–8.

8 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, pp. 448–9.

(766/1364) and Saray Camii (766/1375) – as well as by the existence of the dynastic tomb (787/1385–6) of the late İsfendiyaroğlu rulers located in the forecourt of the Seljuk-period Ulu Cami.⁹

In central Anatolia, it was the emir Eretna and his descendants who were the successors of the Ilkhanids after the death of Abu Sa'īd Khudabanda. Curiously, despite the size of their principality and their well-known support of learning and of literature, the building activities of the beys of Eretna including Kadı Burhaneddin appear to have been only moderately ambitious. In part this appearance may be due to the loss of inscriptions and *vakfiyes* (endowment deeds of a *vakıf*, a pious foundation), although it may also reflect the modest prosperity of the central Anatolian region in the fourteenth century as compared with conditions a century earlier. Nonetheless, a number of important and unusual monuments are found in the main cities of the principality, Kayseri and Sivas, as well as in some of its secondary towns such as Kırşehir and Ürgüp. Among the most notable are the tomb of Eretna Bey's eldest son, Şeyh Hasan, known as the Güdük Minare (748/1347) in Sivas, the so-called Köşk Medresesi (740/1339) in Kayseri and the mosque complex of Taşkın Paşa in Damsa Köyü near Ürgüp. Of the towns themselves, little remains in the way of contemporary accounts, although Mustaufi describes Kayseri as a great city defended by a citadel of squared masonry and Ibn Battuta states that it was one of the chief cities of this land and the residence of one of the *hatuns* of Emir Alaeddin Eretna. As to Sivas, it is described by Ibn Battuta as the largest of the cities possessed by the Ilkhan in Rum and the residence of his emirs and functionaries. He states that it had wide streets and fine buildings, the most outstanding being a hospice for descendants of the Prophet (*dar al-siyāda*) founded by Ghazan Han. Although Erzincan enjoyed considerable prosperity and importance during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, virtually nothing remains of the monuments of that period.

9 Curiously, in contrast to Mustaufi (*The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulūb Composed by Hamd-Allāh Mustawfī of Qazwīn in 740 [1340]*, tr. G. Le Strange (Leiden, 1919), p. 97), Ibn Battuta, who stayed in Kastamonu for forty days in the winter of 1331–2 or 1333–4 describes it as 'one of the largest and finest cities [of Rum]'; *Travels*, II, p. 461. For the monuments and inscriptions of the principality of İsfendiyar, see Mahmut Akok, 'Kastamonu'nun Kasaba Köyünde Candaroğlu Mahmut Bey Camii', *Belleten* 10, 38 (1946), 293–301; A. Gököylü, *Paflagonya, Kastamonu, Sinop, Çankırı, Safranbolu, Bartın, Bolu, Gerede, Mudurnu, İskilip, Bafra, Alaçam ve Civarı Gayrimenkul Eski Eserleri Arkeolojisi* (Kastamonu, 1952); Yaşar Yücel, XIII. – XV. Yüzyıllar Kuzey-Batı Anadolu Tarihi, *Çoban-Oğulları Candar-Oğulları Beylikleri* (Ankara, 1980), pp. 152–81. For the beylik-period monuments of Sinop, see F. Taeschner, 'Die Türbe der İsfendiyaroğlu in Sinop', *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens in Memoriam Ernst Diez* (Istanbul, 1963), pp. 31–3; Ş. Ülkütaşır, 'Sinop'ta Candaroğulları Zamanına Ait Tarihî Eserler', *Türk Tarih, Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi* 5 (1949), 112–51. For epigraphy, see RCEA, 5816, 5953, 6172, 6328, 766–009, 776–018, 787–006, 787–007.

Nonetheless, Mustaufi noted its walls were built of squared masonry, and Clavijo, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, states that while it was not particularly large, it was very populous and possessed many fine streets and beautiful mosques. Located on a plain near the Euphrates, he found it to be surrounded by many towns and fruit gardens and enclosed by walls and towers of stone.¹⁰

Erzurum seems to have suffered an extended period of instability following the collapse of the Ilkhanid state. Occupied successively by the Mongol emir Çobanoğlu Şeyh Hasan (1340), Mehmed Bey, the son of Eretna (1360), the Karakoyunlu Turkomans (1385) and the Akkoyunlu (1465), its existence was apparently too troubled for there to develop any strong tradition of local architectural patronage. Already in the 1330s, Ibn Battuta notes that although of vast extent, the city was largely in ruins in consequence of factional feuds between the Turkomans. However, seventy years later, Clavijo states that while it was formerly the largest and richest city in this country, in his time it was no longer very populous. Indeed, no significant architectural monuments survive in Erzurum from the period following the collapse of the Ilkhans. And east Anatolia as a whole seems to have sunk into considerable disorder, as rival Mongol emirs, Turkoman tribal confederations and outside powers struggled for pre-eminence. The Karakoyunlu Turkomans, who sprang from the region between lakes Van and Urmia, but in time, came to establish their capital at Tabriz, left a scattering of monuments in towns such as Ahlat and Erciş, but their most ambitious building activities were reserved for regions outside east Anatolia. Their rivals, the Akkoyunlu, whose origins lay east of Erzincan in the region of Bayburt, Palu and Ergani, were in time able to establish themselves in Diyarbakır and Mardin as well as in western Iran. Their most important building activities, however, date to the second half of the fifteenth century. As to the Dulgadiroğlu, who ruled the region from Maraş to Malatya in the eastern Taurus, although Elbistan became their capital in 1339, the town was destroyed by Timur in 1400 and again by the

10 For construction and funerary texts of Kayseri in the period of the principality of Eretna, see RCEA, 5812, 6017, 6078, 6128, 6163; for Sivas, RCEA, 6057; also Kemal Göde, *Eratnalılar* (1327–1381) (Ankara, 1994), pp. 157–62. For the monuments of Kayseri, see Albert Gabriel, *MTA*, 1, pp. 3–100. Ibn Battuta's description is found in *Travels*, II, pp. 433–4; for Mustaufi, see Mustaufi, *Geographical*, p. 98. Concerning Sivas, see Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, pp. 434–5; Mustaufi, *Geographical*, p. 95. As regards Erzincan, see Mustaufi, *Geographical*, p. 95; Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand*, AD 1403–6, tr. Clements R. Markham (London, 1859), pp. 72–3; repeated devastation caused by earthquakes has destroyed most of the early monuments of Erzincan and its environs.

Safavid Shah Isma'il in 1507, so that little remains from the period of their ascendancy.¹¹

For the later development of Turkish art and architecture it was to be the Ottoman principality in north-west Anatolia that was to be of particular significance. In the earliest period its key centres were Bursa, conquered by Orhan Gazi in 1326, and İznik, occupied a few years later. By the early fifteenth century, however, other Anatolian towns such as Amasya and Kütahya were also becoming notable foci of Ottoman building activity, while in the Balkans, the conquest of Gelibolu (1354), Dimetoka (1359), Edirne (1361) and Filibe (1363–4) was followed by significant building programmes in those towns as well.

In contrast to most Turkish towns in Anatolia, whose physical appearances and patterns of growth in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries can only vaguely be discerned from scattered buildings and fragmentary travellers' descriptions, the form and evolution of early Ottoman Bursa, and to a lesser extent Edirne, can be reconstructed with some assurance, using epigraphy, standing architectural monuments, documentary sources such as *vakfiye* and early Ottoman historical accounts including Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri. From sources such as these, it is clear that while some urban spaces, notably the religious and social complexes (*külliye*), which were such an outstanding feature of Anatolian Turkish architecture, were the subject of careful planning, as a whole Ottoman towns were the products of a rather haphazard evolution. Thus, for example, while in Bursa or Edirne *külliye* such as the Yıldırım complex, the Yeşil complex and the two Muradiye complexes were consciously built to function as the social and religious foci of new urban districts, the evolution of the surrounding neighbourhoods was far more organic.

Among Ottoman towns it is the evolution of Bursa that is best documented. From available sources it appears that at the time of Orhan Gazi's conquest of the town, it was a centre of only secondary importance with its Greek population restricted to the old Byzantine citadel or Hisar (Fig. 8.1). Shortly thereafter, the Greek residents were forced to move beyond the walls and new Turkish inhabitants were settled within the citadel. Almost immediately, efforts were made to provide the new inhabitants with a Muslim architectural and institutional infrastructure. Indeed, of the twelve mosques built in Bursa during Orhan's reign concerning which we have data, fully seven were located inside the Hisar, the earliest being the no longer extant İl Eri Oğlu Ahmed

11 For south-east Anatolia, see Albert Gabriel, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale* (Paris, 1940); also for Mardin, Ara Altun, *Mardin'de Türk Devri Mimarisi* (Istanbul, 1971); for Diyarbakır, Metin Sözen, *Diyarbakır'da Türk Mimarisi* (Istanbul, 1971); also Sözen, *Anadolu'da Akkoyunlu Mimarisi* (Istanbul, 1981).




Figure 8.1 Plan of Bursa showing expansion of city in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (based on Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, p. 9)

Bey Mescidi adjoining the Bey Sarayı, built according to Neşri immediately following the conquest. The Alaeddin Bey Camii can be dated by its *vakfiye* to 733/1332–3 and the Orhan Gazi Camii can be dated by its inscription, which is all that survives from it, to 738/1337–8. Documentation exists as well for the construction of a pair of *medreses* in the Hisar, plus several bathhouses (*hamams*). Finally, a tomb was built in the north of the Hisar for Orhan's father, Osman Gazi, who had originally been buried in Söğüt, and the adjoining residence of the Greek *tekmur* or governor was rebuilt as the Bey Sarayı.

Simultaneous with this transformation of the Hisar, an energetic effort was made to develop a commercial district in the eastern suburbs of Bursa. It was here, for example, that Orhan Gazi built a social-religious complex (740/1339–40), including a mosque, *medrese*, *mekteb* (school) and *imaret-zaviye*. In addition, several commercial buildings were erected, most notably Orhan Gazi's Emir Hanı (or Eski Bezzazistan) and the Bezir Hanı of Lala Şahin Paşa.

This process of expansion beyond the walls of the Hisar continued in the reign of Murad I, with the construction of the sultan's Kapan Hanı in the eastern commercial district and of the Koca Naib Camii just outside the Kaplıca Kapısı to the west of the Hisar. However, Murad's most significant foundations were located in the Hisar itself, where he built the congregational Şehadet Camii, and in the rather remote suburb of Çekirge, two kilometres west of the citadel, where, beginning in 767/1366, he built a major complex including a mosque, *medrese*, *imaret*, *hamam* and tomb (*türbe*). Yıldırım Bayezid's efforts were concentrated to the east of the Hisar. He founded the Ulu Cami in the commercial quarter and the great Yıldırım complex beyond the Gök Dere, some two kilometres east of the Hisar in an area which in the late fourteenth century must still have been well beyond the city's limits. Development seems to have occurred in this period as well in the area to the north-east of the commercial quarter known as At Pazarı, in Pınar Başı, the district to the south-east of the Hisar, and in Çınar Önü to the west of the citadel.

Although Bursa was sacked and burned by a contingent of Timur's army following the defeat of Bayezid I at Ankara in 1402, the city recovered during the reign of Çelebi Mehmed, when, with the construction of the Yeşil complex, it was extended in a definitive way to the east of the Gök Dere. Bursa's most striking growth in this period occurred during the prosperous reign of Murad II, when new districts were endowed and named after Sultan Murad, Fazlullah Paşa, Hacı İvaz Paşa, Hasan Paşa, Umur Bey, Cebe-Âli Bey, Şihabeddin Paşa and Reyhan. Although the most densely settled districts continued to be located round the Hisar and the market quarter to its east, the area beyond the Gök Dere, centred on the Yeşil complex and Emir Sultan, now began to be built up as

well. The construction of two new bridges across the Gök Dere at this time (the Boyacı Kulu and İrgandı bridges) can be explained by the development of these eastern districts. Expansion occurred to the west as well, where in 1426 Murad completed his mosque, *medrese*, *imaret* complex, the Muradiye, on the road to Çekirge. Thus, by 1432, when the Burgundian merchant and spy Bertrandon de la Broquière passed through Bursa, he encountered a town which was ‘a very fine commercial centre, the best city belonging to the Grand Turk’, a town, moreover, which appeared even larger than it was, for it was made up of a series of distinct quarters (Bertrandon calls them villages) separated by a river (the Gök Dere) flowing north from Ulu Dağ (the Bithynian Olympus). It was in Bursa, he noted, that the Ottoman sultans were buried and in the town ‘there are many nice buildings, like hospitals, in three or four of which bread, meat and wine (*sic*) are distributed to those [in need]’. In addition, there were two bazaars, in one of which, among other things, silks, precious stones, pearls and cotton cloth were sold, while in the other cottons and white soap were important items of trade. ‘On a low mountain at the western end of the city there is a fine, large castle. There are about a thousand houses inside. This is [the site of] the lord’s very beautiful residence . . . [within which] there is a garden and a very nice pool where the lord takes his ease.’¹²

Architecture of the beylik and early Ottoman periods

The architecture of the beylik and early Ottoman periods has been the subject of attention by architectural historians since the end of the nineteenth century. Pioneering efforts by European scholars such as Friedrich Sarre, Rudolf Riefstahl and Albert Gabriel, whose surveys were organised regionally rather than chronologically, did much to introduce to the learned public what had hitherto been a largely unknown field. During the 1930s and 1940s, further efforts were made to publish the monuments of key early Ottoman centres, including Bursa, Edirne and İznik, to examine the architecture of particular Turkoman principalities and to survey systematically specific architectural types dating to the period of the beyliks. Since the late 1950s, what had earlier

12 Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage d’Outremer*, tr. Galen R. Kline (New York, 1988), pp. 83–5; for Schiltberger, see *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia and Africa, 1396–1427*, tr. J. Buchan Telfer (London, 1879), p. 40. For an important general account of the evolution of the city, see Oya Pancaroğlu, ‘Architecture, Landscape, and Patronage in Bursa: the Making of an Ottoman Capital City’, *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 19 (1995), 40–55; also Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, ‘Bursa’, in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1941–) [henceforth *İA*], II, pp. 806–15.

been a rather modest flow of publication has turned into a veritable torrent, the most important work being undertaken by Turkish architects and art historians such as Oktay Aslanapa, Aptullah Kuran, Oluş Arık, Metin Sözen and Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal. Aslanapa, for one, has carried out important excavations of beylik and early Ottoman monuments with the aim of clarifying specific questions of plan and date. Finally, Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi published a monumental, multi-volume documentation of Ottoman architecture through the period of Mehmed II. Notwithstanding the sheer volume of this literature, the fact remains that there has appeared no study of the Turkish monuments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries that seeks to integrate in a comparative manner Ottoman materials with those of the other principalities. Nonetheless, the typologies and developmental outlines of this architecture are well known.¹³

As noted above, the proliferation of independent Turkoman principalities at the beginning of the fourteenth century gave rise to a number of regional centres of architectural activity and produced an environment in which the broad stylistic unity that had characterised Seljuk architecture in the thirteenth century was supplanted by one of pronounced local distinctions. Central and east Anatolia, with old and relatively deeply rooted Islamic traditions, continued to build in styles clearly descended from the Seljuks. The west Anatolian principalities, on the other hand, were more experimental and eclectic in their architecture, not only drawing on ideas and vocabularies, techniques and

13 Regional surveys include Friedrich Sarre, *Konya, Seldschukische Baudenkmäler* (Berlin, 1921); Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum arabicarum, Troisième partie, Asie Mineure, tome premier – Siwas, Diwrigi* (Cairo, 1917); Riefstahl, *Turkish Architecture*; Gabriel, MTA; Gabriel, *Voyage archéologique*; Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, *Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d'Erzurum et de sa région* (Paris, 1968). The early Ottoman monuments of key towns of the principality are dealt with in: Katharina Otto-Dorn, *Das Islamische Iznik, mit einem quellenkundlichen Beitrag von Robert Anhegger*, *Istanbuler Forschungen*, vol. XIII (Berlin, 1941); Sedat Çetintaş, *Türk Mimari Anıtları, Osmanlı Devri. Bursa'da İlk Eserler* (Istanbul, 1946); Çetintaş, *Türk Mimari Anıtları, Osmanlı Devri, Bursa'da Murad I ve Bayezid I Binaları* (Istanbul, 1952); Albert Gabriel, *Une capitale turque, Brousse, Bursa*, 2 vols., Paris, 1958; Oktay Aslanapa, *Edirne'de Osmanlı Devri Abideleri* (Istanbul, 1949). On beylik mosque architecture, see Ali Kızıltan, *Anadolu Beyliklerinde Cami ve Mescitler* (Istanbul, 1958); and on the architecture of the Karaman beylik and some of its broader implications, Ernst Diez, Oktay Aslanapa and Mahmud Mesut Koman, *Karaman Devri Sanatı* (Istanbul, 1950). Of fundamental importance for the early Ottoman period are Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri 630–805 (1230–1402)* (Istanbul, 1966) [henceforth OMİD]; and Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri 806–855 (1403–1451)* (Istanbul, 1972) [henceforth ÇSMD]. Typologies are found in Celâl Esad Arseven, *Türk Sanatı Tarihi* (Istanbul, n.d.); M. Oluş Arık, 'Turkish Architecture in Asia Minor in the Period of the Emirates', in *The Art and Architecture of Turkey*, ed. Ekrem Akurgal (New York, 1980), pp. 111–37; Aptullah Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture* (Chicago, 1968); M. Oluş Arık, '"Türbe" Forms in Early Anatolian-Turkish Architecture', *Anadolu (Anatolia)* 17 (1969), 101–19.

formulae derived from the Seljuks, but borrowing as well from the Antique and Byzantine building traditions encountered in these newly acquired frontier lands and from the Mamluks' architecture. It should not be concluded, however, that the old Seljuk heartland and the lands of the western frontier constituted two distinctly separate architectural provinces existing in isolation from one another. In fact there was a good deal of overlap, especially in the fourteenth century, buildings of a strongly Seljuk character at times appearing in the lands of the western *uc*, and structures of a more innovative sort usually associated with the western border lands being erected in the Anatolian interior.

Mosques

Beylik and early Ottoman mosque architecture is characterised by a striking diversity of form and planning that often defies arrangement in neat and simple typologies. Among the most common types, three groups stand out: the single-dome mosque; the hypostyle congregational mosque; and so-called *zaviye*-mosque. Of these, by far the most common is the simple single-dome mosque, consisting of a square prayer hall covered by a single dome on squinches, Turkish triangles or pendentives. Where present, minarets are usually attached to the right or left of the entry façade, although in some instances, such as the Kazirzade Mosque (late fourteenth century) in Tire and the original Orhan Gazi Camii (early fourteenth century) in Bilecik, the minaret is a detached, free-standing structure. Of generally small dimension, this type of mosque was built throughout Anatolia and the Ottoman Balkans in both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Its antecedents are to be found in the Seljuk architecture of the thirteenth century, in mosques such as those of Ferruh Şah (621/1224) in Akşehir and the Hacı Ferruh (612/1215–16) in Konya. In its simplest form this single-dome mosque type is exemplified by buildings such as the Saray Mescidi (776/1375) in Sinop, the Pekmez Pazarı Mescidi (783/1381–2) of Kütahya and the Kubbeli Mescid (731/1331) of Afyon.

Not all single-domed mosques are so modest, however. In scale, materials and workmanship perhaps the most striking single-dome mosque of the period is the İlyas Bey Camii at Balat (Miletus) (Fig. 8.2), built in 806/1404 by the emir of Menteşe, following the restoration of his principality's independence by Timur. Part of a larger complex consisting, in addition to the mosque, of a *medrese* and the tomb of the founder, all arranged around an irregular courtyard, the İlyas Bey Camii is square in plan, measuring 18 metres on the exterior façades. Built of rubble and roughly drafted stone, it is revetted on both interior and exterior with a veneer of reused marble taken from the




Figure 8.2 (a, b) İlyas Bey Camii, Balat (Miletus), plan and view of north façade
(Photo Walter B. Denny)

Antique monuments of Miletus. In old photographs a brick minaret can be seen adjoining its north-west corner. The square prayer hall is covered by a 14-metre dome on squinches filled with Turkish triangles and scalloped fluting. Illumination is provided by two rows of windows, the lower ones covered by iron grates while the upper windows are screened with marble grilles of geometric openwork. On their exteriors these windows are framed by varied torus and *muqarnas* mouldings and are spanned by relief-carved lintels enriched with geometric, epigraphic and vegetal compositions, some inlaid in blue and red marble intarsia work. The *eyvan*-like porch on the north façade, virtually unique in Anatolia, encloses three hipped arches of bichrome (*ablak*) voussoirs in the Mamluk style, carried on reused Antique columns with *muqarnas* capitals. Geometric openwork screens close off the openings to the right and left of the central gateway bay. The interior of the mosque is dominated by a magnificent marble *mihrab* framed by borders of *muqarnas* and geometric strapwork with vegetal compositions in the spandrels and six rows of *muqarnas* in its half dome. The stone carving of the İlyas Bey Camii, extraordinary for its meticulous and elegant workmanship, makes the Balat mosque one of the outstanding monuments of the period of the emirates. Typologically, however, the mosque belongs to the simple, single-dome group, although its dome is one of the largest of the period.

A common variant on the single-dome mosque has a portico (*son cemaat yeri*) of two, three or five domed or vaulted bays across the entry façade. This arrangement is encountered in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century mosques throughout Anatolia and the Balkans, including the mosques of Hacı Özbek (734/1333–4) in İznik, İbn Neccar (754/1353) in Kastamonu, the Kurşunlu Camii (779/1377–8) in Kütahya, the Ak Mescid (800/1397–8) in Afyon, the Karahasan Camii (early fifteenth century) in Tire and the Eski Cami (811/1408–9) at Zağra in Bulgaria. A further variant is characterised by an extension in one or more directions of the mosque's interior space beyond the limits of the square, dome-covered bay. Such is the case, for example, with the Orhan Gazi Camii at Bilecik (early fourteenth century), covered by a dome measuring c.9.50 metres supported on four enormous corner piers linked by pointed arches so as to form an interior with a cruciform plan. A more common variant, found in Murad II's Darülhadis Camii (838/1434–5) in Edirne, has a vestibule between the portico on the mosque's entry façade and the domed prayer hall. The most outstanding example of this arrangement is the Yeşil Cami in İznik (Fig. 8.3), constructed by the architect (*banı*) Hacı bin Musa between 780/1378 and 794/1392 for Çandarlı Halil Hayreddin Paşa (d. 1387). The mosque's portico of three bays is covered by a flat-topped cross-vault, with a tall octagonal drum





Figure 8.3 (a, b) Yeşil Cami, İzmit, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and view from north-west (Photo Katharine Branning)

topped by a fluted dome rising from the centre vault. The square prayer hall, a typical single-domed square mosque, has a belt of Turkish triangles in the zone of transition. Between the prayer hall and the portico stands a vestibule screened from the rest of the mosque's interior by a pair of massive columns linked by pointed arches. Consisting of three bays, the vestibule, in its vaulting, mirrors the portico, with the centre vault supporting a tall fluted dome with a blind lantern. The exterior of the mosque, like that of İlyas Bey at Balat, is revetted with a veneer of marble, which is applied to the lower part of the interior walls as well. As with the Balat mosque, a brick minaret adjoins the mosque on the right and is decorated in the Seljuk manner with glazed tiles, from the colours of which the mosque, not surprisingly, derives its name.¹⁴

Many, although by no means all, single-domed mosques functioned as *mahalle* or small neighbourhood mosques. Congregational mosques (*cami*) were generally larger than most single-dome mosques and were characterised by a wide variety of plans, including both hypostyle and basilical arrangements. The most conservative of these congregational mosques are to be found in central Anatolia, in the principality of Karaman, and are distinguished by one or more arcades or colonnades running parallel to the *kible* wall, as in the Ulu Cami (1302–3) of Ermenak (Fig. 8.4). A plainly constructed building of roughly drafted stone, it has a rectangular prayer hall divided into three aisles by squat, heavy masonry arcades. A small entry vestibule stands to the west of the prayer hall and the entire structure was covered by a flat timber and earthen roof. Recalling in its plan such Seljuk period mosques as the east wing of the Alaeddin Camii (probably before 1155) of Konya, the Ulu Cami of Ermenak finds Karamanid parallels in the Hacıbeyler (759/1357–8), Arapzade (1374–1420) and Dikbasan mosques (840/1436) of Karaman.

While the Ulu Cami of Ermenak was no doubt the reflection of an indigenous, Anatolian vernacular tradition, other related mosques with aisles paralleling the *kible* wall, but with large, domed bays or transepts on the axis of the *mihrab*, have Syrian connections. The earliest examples of this type are to be found in the Artukid lands of south-east Anatolia. Examples include the Ulu Cami of Diyarbakır (seventh century but rebuilt in 1091–2 and restored later), the Ulu Cami of Mayyafarikin (Silvan, finished in 1157) and the Ulu Cami of Dunaysir (601/1204). That mosques of this sort continued to be built in south-east Anatolia into the fourteenth century is attested by the Latifiye Camii

14 For the İlyas Bey Camii in Balat (Miletus), see Aynur Durukian, *Balat İlyas Bey Camii* (Ankara, 1988); K. Wulzinger, P. Wittek and F. Sarre (eds.), *Das Islamische Milet* (Berlin, 1935). The Yeşil Cami of İznik is treated by Otto Dorn, 'Das Islamische İznik', pp. 20–33; Ayverdi, *OMİD*, pp. 309–19; Kuran, *Mosque*, pp. 61–3.



(a)



(b)

Figure 8.4 (a, b) Ulu Cami, Ermenak, plan (based on Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, p. 6) and view of prayer hall interior along *kible* wall (Photo Bildarchiv/image archive Das Bild des Orients, Berlin, photographer J. Gierlichs)

of Mardin (772/1371), built by a certain ‘Abd al-Laiḥ b. ‘Abdallāh, an official in the service of the Artukid rulers Melik Mahmud el-Salih and Melik Davud II el-Muzaffer. It was in the principality of Aydın in western Anatolia, however, that the most interesting and historically significant example of this sort of mosque was built in the fourteenth century. The İsa Bey Camii (776/1375) (Fig. 8.5) in Ayasoluk, built by the emir of Aydın İsa b. Muhammad, is a large rectangular





Figure 8.5 (a, b) İsa Bey Camii, Ayasoluk, plan (after Kuran, *Mosque*, p. 62, courtesy University of Chicago Press) and view from south (Photo Walter B. Denny)

structure measuring some 52 by 56 metres, enclosed by high walls of limestone and marble, much of it spoils from the nearby ruins of Ephesus. While the north, east and south walls are of roughly drafted masonry, that on the west is fashioned of carefully cut stone, emphasising its importance as the mosque's main façade. Within, the İsa Bey Camii is divided into a long, narrow prayer hall on the south preceded on the north by a rectangular courtyard, formerly enclosed by colonnaded porches on three sides. Three gateways give access to the courtyard, one on the north, and another pair functioning as well as the plinths of a pair of minarets, at the point where, on east and west, the porches join the prayer hall. In its interior the prayer hall is divided by a colonnade into a pair of aisles paralleling the *kible*, which in turn are cut by a transept of two domed bays on triangular pendentives on the axis of the *mihrab*. The antecedent for this plan is immediately apparent as being found in the Umayyad caliph al-Walid's early eighth-century Great Mosque of Damascus, a connection which is explained by the name of the architect, 'Ali b. al-Dimashqi, given in the construction text over the west portal. This Syrian link is further emphasised by the portal's tall, narrow dimensions, by the angular knotting in bichrome marble reminiscent of Ayyubid Aleppo in its spandrels and by the bichrome (*ablak*) joggled joints of the relieving arches over the lower windows of the west façade.¹⁵

A second type of beylik-period congregational mosque has columns or piers arranged in rows perpendicular to the *kible* wall to form a central nave and side aisles. Like the Ulu Cami of Ermenak, the origins of this 'basilical' type are to be sought in Seljuk mosque architecture of the thirteenth century, in buildings such as the Ulu Cami (626/1229) of Divriği, the Alaeddin Camii (620/1223) of Niğde, and the Eşrefoğlu Camii (699/1299–1300) of Beyşehir. A particularly fine fourteenth-century example is Sungur Bey Camii (736/1335–6) of Niğde (Fig. 8.6) with its unusual north and east portals (the latter flanked by a pair of minarets) and its manifestly Gothic features, including bipartite and rose windows and a ribbed pointed groin vault in the east porch, inspired perhaps by Cilician Armenian architects. Although much modified following a fire in the eighteenth century, there can be no question but that the interior was originally divided by arcades into a central nave and side aisles covered by groin and star vaults (although Gabriel speculates that the bays of the nave were covered with domes). In the principalities of western Anatolia,

15 For the Ulu Cami of Ermenak, see Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 5–7; Kızıltan, *Anadolu Beyliklerinde Cami*, p. 20; the mosques of Karaman are discussed in *ibid.*, pp. 26–9; also Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 35–43. For the İsa Bey Mosque in Ayasoluk, see Otto-Dorn, 'Die İsa Bey Moschee in Ephesus'.





Figure 8.6 (a, b) Sungur Bey Camii, Niğde, plan (after Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 1, p. 125) and view of north portal (Photo Walter B. Denny)

'basilical' plans are found in the Ulu Cami of Birgi (712/1312–13), the Ulu Cami of Tire (early fifteenth century) and the Mahmud Bey Camii (768/1366–7) of Kasaba Köyü near Kastamonu. Examples from the Ottoman lands include the Yıldırım Camii of Bergama (801/1398–9), the Hüdavendigar Camii of Plovdiv (c.1389) and, following İ. H. Ayverdi and Robert Anhegger's reconstructions, the Şehadet Camii in the Hisar of Bursa (767/1365–6).¹⁶

Still another type of congregational mosque, one associated most closely with the Ottomans, is characterised by a hypostyle arrangement of piers or columns which divide the interior into a multiplicity of equal bays, each covered with a separate dome. An early example is the Hamidid Yivli Minare Camii (774/1373) of Antalya, divided by twelve reused columns into six equal bays covered by domes on Turkish triangles. Built on the foundations of an earlier Byzantine church, the symmetry of the mosque is disrupted by the awkward trapezoidal extension of the prayer hall on the west. Other examples of this domed hypostyle type are to be found in what was the Ottoman principal-ity, the two most outstanding being the Ulu Cami of Bursa (c.802/1399–1400) built by Bayezid I to commemorate his victory in the battle of Niğbolu (Nikopolis), and the Eski Cami of Edirne (805–16/1403–14), begun by Süleyman Çelebi and completed by his brother Musa. The former (Fig. 8.7), a large, rectangular building measuring 68 by 56 metres, is built of finely drafted limestone with exterior façades enlivened and unified by blind arcades that mirror each row of domes and frame two storeys of windows. The main entrance in the north façade is a projecting portal in the Seljuk manner, although its carving is less exuberant than that of most of its thirteenth-century antecedents. In the interior the mosque is divided into twenty equal bays by twelve enormous piers, with each bay in turn being covered by a hemispheric dome on pendentives. The dome at the intersection of the mosque's longitudinal and transverse axes as established by its north portal and *mihrab* niche, and its two side portals, has an open oculus beneath which there is a sixteen-sided pool with a fountain. Although on the interior the domes appear equal in height, it is apparent on the exterior that as one moves from the sides towards the centre the elevation of each row of domes is increased. The mosque, though devoid of a portico, has two minarets, placed at the corners of the north façade, that on the north-west

16 For the Sungur Bey Camii, Niğde, see Gabriel, *MTA*, 1, pp. 123–35; for the Ulu Cami of Birgi, Riefstahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, pp. 26–30; the Ulu Cami of Tire, Aslanoğlu, *Tire*, pp. 24–6. For the Yıldırım Camii in Bergama, the Hüdavendigar Camii in Plovdiv and the Şehadet Camii in Bursa, see Oktay Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture* (New York, 1971), p. 196; Ayverdi, *OMİD*, pp. 267–75, 295–303, 373–8; Robert Anhegger, 'Beitrag zur Frühosmanischen Baugeschichte', in *Zeki Velîdî Togan'a Armağan* (Istanbul, 1950–5), pp. 301–30.



(a)




(b)

Figure 8.7 (a, b) Ulu Cami, Bursa, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and interior of prayer hall (Photo Walter B. Denny)

dating to Bayezid's original foundation, while the one on the north-east was probably added by Mehmed I between 815/1413 and 821/1421.

While the domes of the Ulu Cami of Bursa are all of equal dimension, the *mihrab* axis is nonetheless highlighted by the raised elevation of the domes placed along it. This tendency to emphasise the *mihrab* and its axis is characteristic of beylik and early Ottoman-period congregational mosques, and accounts for the placement of the transept on the *mihrab* axis of the İsa Bey Camii of Ayasoluk, for the increased breadth and height of the central nave of 'basilical' mosques like the Sungur Bey Camii of Niğde and the Ulu Cami of Birgi, and for the large dome constructed over the *mihrab* bay of Latifiye Camii in Mardin. Of course, none of these devices are the innovations of the fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century builders. All have antecedents reaching back to the earliest centuries of Islamic architecture and are encountered in buildings such as the Great Mosque of Qairawan in Tunisia and the Azhar and Hakim mosques in Cairo, not to mention the Seljuk-period mosques of thirteenth-century Anatolia. Rather more original was a tendency in some beylik and early Ottoman congregational mosques of the hypostyle type to merge several bays before the *mihrab* under a single larger dome, a tendency not only giving expression to the importance of the *mihrab*, but reflective as well of an ongoing interest on the part of Anatolian Turkish architects in experimenting with domical vaulting and pushing its limits as covering for ever larger interior spaces (as in the closed court *medreses* of Celaleddin Karatay and Fahreddin Ali in Konya). In western Anatolia towards the end of the fourteenth century, this tendency to experiment with the construction of large domes, now over the *mihrab* bays of multi-bay hypostyle congregational mosques, is encountered in the Ulu Cami (778/1376) of Manisa (Fig. 8.8).

Built by İshak Bey, the ruler of the principality of Saruhan, it has been described as having the most important and most interesting plan of any of the fourteenth-century mosques in Anatolia. It was built as part of a complex including, in addition to the mosque, a *medrese* and the tomb of the founder, both contiguous to it on the west. In plan, the mosque is formed of two approximately equal spaces, a prayer hall on the south and a portico-enclosed fountain court on the north, both measuring approximately 16 by 30 metres. Not only are the dimensions similar; the plans of the two units mirror one another as well. Thus, the prayer hall, nine bays wide and four bays deep, is covered by a series of small domical vaults, except for the space, equivalent to nine bays, before the *mihrab* niche. This latter is surmounted by a single large dome of 10.8 metres on pendentives, carried by an octagon of arches supported by six great piers and the *kible* wall. Although the placement of



(a)



(b)

Figure 8.8 (a, b) İlyas Bey Camii, Manisa, plan (after Riefstahl, *Southwestern Anatolia*, fig. 3) and view of prayer hall interior (Photo Walter B. Denny)

a large dome on an octagon before the *mihrab* niche to create a prayer hall with unified interior space has, possibly, some tenuous connection with similar arrangements in south-east Anatolian mosque architecture of the twelfth and early thirteenth century, the use of this formula in the Ulu Cami of Manisa represents a new development for western Anatolia, one which was to be of considerable significance for the later evolution of Ottoman architecture. Important as well in the context of Ottoman architectural development is the courtyard of İshak Bey's mosque. Like the prayer hall, it measures seven bays in width and four in depth, but with the area on the south, again equivalent to nine bays, left open and forming a fountain court immediately before the prayer hall façade. This open, arcaded fountain court is a feature almost entirely absent from Anatolian Seljuk mosque architecture, and along with the large dome of the prayer hall, is a feature which anticipates developments more fully expressed in the Ottoman architecture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

It is in mosques such as the Güzelce Hasan Bey Camii (809/1406–7) of Hayrabolu near Tekirdağ and, more significantly, in the Üç Şerefeli Cami of Edirne (841–51/1437–47) that these tendencies first manifested in the Manisa mosque are taken up by the Ottomans. The Üç Şerefeli Mosque, in particular (Fig. 8.9), represents a bold leap in both planning and structure. Built by Murad II in the years immediately before the conquest of Constantinople, the mosque is almost square in layout, measuring 66.5 by 64.5 metres, with an oblong prayer hall approximately two-thirds as deep as the fountain court that precedes it. The courtyard, which can be entered through the main portal on the north and a lateral gateway on the west, is surrounded by a portico covered by twenty-two round and elliptical domes of various sizes, with five bays along the south side of the courtyard and seven along its north. It is the oblong prayer hall, however, which is the most distinguishing feature of Murad's mosque. Like the Ulu Cami of Manisa, it can be seen as a multi-domed congregational mosque of eight units, the four central units of which have been merged and covered by a large central dome of 24 metres. The effect produced by its lower flanking domes and high central dome is one that foreshadows the pyramidal massing of volumes characteristic of the great imperial mosques of Istanbul of the sixteenth century. In contrast to the Ulu Cami of Manisa, the central dome of the Edirne mosque is carried on a hexagon, supported on north and south by the walls of the prayer hall and on east and west by a pair of enormous hexagonal piers. On the exterior, the dodecagonal drum of the central dome is reinforced by eight flying buttresses, apparently the first use of this device in Ottoman architecture. As seen from the interior, the central dome completely dominates the senses, although the perception of




Figure 8.9 (a, b) Üç Şerefeli Cami, Edirne, plan (after Kuran, *Mosque*, p. 177, courtesy University of Chicago Press) and view of covering showing arrangement of prayer hall domes (Photo Walter B. Denny)

spatial unity that it is intended to produce is decreased by the low hang of the hexagon's arches. Four minarets of unequal height and disparate design are set at the corners of the courtyard, that at the south-west, soaring to a height of 67.65 metres, being, after the minarets of the nearby Selimiye Camii, the highest in Ottoman architecture. Its three balconies (*şerefe*) give Murad's mosque its name.

The Üç Şerefeli Cami is, thus, a kind of climax to Turkish architectural developments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, deriving as it does, on the one hand, from the Anatolian hypostyle congregational mosque of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and, on the other, from the continuing experimentation by Turkish builders with the construction of ever more expansive domical vaults. In both plan and structure, the mosque must be seen as the point of departure for the development of the great mosques dominated by vast, centralising domes that characterise Ottoman architecture of the classical period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁷

Finally, in addition to simple single-domed mosques and a variety of congregational mosques, art historical literature frequently distinguishes a third Turkish mosque type of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century, the so-called Bursa or reverse-T mosque. Recent research suggests that this latter type was, in fact, a multi-purpose building serving a variety of functions, educational, social and religious, and with this in mind the term *zaviye*-mosque has been proposed to describe it. Arguments in favour of the multi-functional explanation have been most systematically put forth by Semavi Eyice, who notes that these buildings are typically characterised by a T-plan with a dome-covered *mihrab* hall on the *kible* side of the building, a dome-covered fountain court behind it, symmetrically arranged chambers flanking the fountain court on right and left, and a portico along the north façade. Minarets, where they exist, can generally be shown to be later additions.

More than sixty structures of this sort dating to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are still extant, almost all of them on territories which had been brought within the frontiers of the Ottoman principality. Early examples include the Nilüfer Hatun İmareti (790/1388) and Yakub Çelebi Zaviyesi (late fourteenth century) in İznik, and the Firuz Bey Camii (797/1394–5) in Milas. It is in Bursa and Edirne, however, that the finest buildings of this sort are to be found, among them the Hüdavendigâr İmareti (767–87/1366–85) of Murad


17 For the Ulu Cami of Bursa, Ayverdi, *OMİD*, pp. 401–18; Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, 1, pp. 31–9; Kuran, *Mosque*, pp. 151–3. For the Ulu Cami of Manisa, see Riefstahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, pp. 7–15; for the Üç Şerefeli of Edirne, Kuran, *Mosque*, pp. 177–81; Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, pp. 203–5; Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 422–62.

I in Çekirge, Yıldırım Bayezid's Bayezid İmareti (begun c.793/1390) in Bursa's eastern suburbs, and Murad II's Muradiye Camii (830/1426) to the west of the Hisar and Muradiye Zaviyesi (839/1436) on the northern outskirts of Edirne, each the core of a larger complex including tombs, *medreses*, *hamams* and *imarets*.

Unquestionably the most spectacular of the *zaviye*-mosques of Bursa is the Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20) (Fig. 8.10), built by Çelebi Mehmed, with work on its decoration continuing until 1424. Part of a *küllîye* including a *medrese*, *imaret* and tomb, its architect was Hacı İvaz b. Ahi Bayezid, who also built the Çelebi Sultan Mehmed Camii (824/1421) at Dimetoka in eastern Thrace. The mosque was originally preceded by a five-bay portico that collapsed in the earthquake of 1855. In its present form, therefore, the façade is divided into two storeys, reflecting the two-storey elevation of the entry block behind it. While the windows on the first storey are enclosed in *muqarnas* frames and richly carved blind arches, those of the second storey are designed as balconies and contain low, openwork stone balustrades. The tall portal, extending to the roofline, is recessed into the façade. Carved with low-relief vegetal interlace decoration, it represents a clear break with the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century design and is the first in an imperial Ottoman style which will be continued with little change until the nineteenth century.

In the interior the mosque has four *eyvans* – three large and one small – opening on the domed central fountain court. That on the south contains a *mihrab* and functioned as a prayer hall. The two side *eyvans*, slightly smaller in size, are each flanked by a pair of rooms, while the smaller north *eyvan* was the entrance passage. The lavishly decorated entrance block includes a second-storey balcony overlooking the fountain court which must have functioned as an imperial tribune (*hünkâr mahfili*). While the entrance *eyvan* is covered by a barrel vault, the side *eyvans*, *kible eyvan* and central courtyard are all covered by domes on belts of Turkish triangles and squinches. An octagonal pool stands at the centre of the fountain court under the dome's nineteenth-century lantern that replaced the open oculus of the fifteenth century. Also of nineteenth-century date are the two minarets that stand at the corners of the entry façade.

While there is little in the overall design of the Yeşil Cami to distinguish it from other contemporary *zaviye*-mosques in Bursa and Edirne, its decoration imparts to it a quality of richness and exuberance that supports its claim to be the most beautiful of early Ottoman architectural monuments. Indeed, it seems no effort or expense was spared in its construction and embellishment. Built of carefully drafted stone, its façade, portal and window frames are all of



(a)



(b)

Figure 8.10 (a, b) Yeşil complex, Bursa, site plan and view of south-west exterior of mosque (Photo Walter B. Denny)

marble. But the most sumptuous part of the mosque is its interior, originally enriched with painted (*kalem işi*) foliate arabesques, some traces of which still survive to the present day, and by extravagant revetments of *cuerda seca* tiles recalling in both technique and aspiration the expansive tile façades of Timurid Samarkand and Herat.¹⁸

While popular opinion and some architectural historians continue to hold that these T-plan buildings were mosques, as the current name of Çelebi Mehmed's foundation, Yeşil Cami, would seem to affirm, scholars have long puzzled over the function of the side rooms which flank the central court, describing them as, among other things, halls of state and *medreses*. It was the Turkish architect Sedat Çetintaş who first advanced the notion that they functioned as *zaviyes*, that is, as hospices for itinerant dervishes and travellers, an idea which was further supported by the research of Semavi Eyice, who saw their most immediate precursors in such buildings as the thirteenth-century *hanekah* of the Sahib Ata Fahreddin Ali (678/1279–80) adjoining his Larende Camii in Konya. That the side rooms do seem to have functioned as hospice rooms (*tabhane*) is suggested by the presence in them of built-in cupboards and fireplaces, which could be used for storage and for the comfort of guests. Even more telling is the fact that in their foundation inscriptions, their *vakfiyes* and other contemporary documents, many of these buildings are referred to not as mosques but as *imarets* or *zaviyes*. Thus, despite their present designations, these buildings seem to have been multi-purpose structures, serving the needs not only of worship but also of charity and learning. Their foundation appears to have been associated in at least some cases with *ahi* fraternities, those semi-religious orders of late Seljuk and early Ottoman times recruited mainly from among the ranks of craftsmen devoted to the ideals of *fütüvva*. While intended to provide shelter for travellers (Ibn Battuta's account of his travels in early fourteenth-century Anatolia includes descriptions not only of hospices of this sort but of the *ahis* who maintained them), they at the same time provided moral and material support for the process of Turkicisation and Islamicisation in newly settled areas during the period of Ottoman expansion. Subsequently, as the *ahi* orders lost their original character in the sixteenth century, these *zaviye*-mosques lost some of these functions and were transformed into the simple mosques that they are today.¹⁹

18 See the section on ceramics, pp. 336–46, below.

19 For an important general discussion of the so-called 'Bursa' type mosques and their function, see Eyice, 'İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini-İçtimai bir Müessesesi', pp. 3–80. For the Yeşil Cami, see Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 46–94; Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 79–94.

Medreses

Medreses of the beylik and early Ottoman periods continue the two types of Seljuk *medreses* of the thirteenth century. The more common of these, the open court type, is found not only in Anatolia but in the Ottoman Balkans as well. A fine example is the Hatuniye Medrese (783/1381–2) (Fig. 8.11) in Karaman founded by Nefise Sultan, the wife of the Karamanid ruler Alaeddin Bey and daughter of the Ottoman sultan Murad I. Symmetrical in plan, the building has a heavily decorated and rather archaic gateway copied from that of the thirteenth-century Gök Medresesi in Sivas, which projects strongly from the north façade. Beyond the gateway, a small entry *eyvan* flanked by a pair of small domed rooms gives access to the *medrese's* central courtyard. The sides of the courtyard were bordered by arcaded porticos of reused columns, behind which were domed student rooms. At the back of the courtyard a raised *eyvan* presumably served as the summer classroom (*dershane*). In the traditional Seljuk manner, it is flanked on either side by a pair of square, domed rooms entered through doors enclosed by frames richly carved with palmette and lotus motifs. Although her cenotaph (*sanduka*) is no longer extant, the room to the left of the *eyvan* originally contained the tomb of the founder, while that to the right was perhaps a winter classroom. Meinecke has established that both the *eyvan* and the tomb chamber had dados of dark turquoise-green glazed hexagonal tiles and it may well be that the cenotaph was revetted with faience as well. An inscription on the gateway identifies the architect (*mimar*) as Hoca Ahmad b. Nu'man. Although the *medrese* is today heavily restored, it is clear that it was originally the most richly decorated building of Karaman.

Similarly planned beylik open court *medreses* include the Karamanid Tol Medrese (740/1339–40) in Ermenak and the Hatuniye Medrese (835/1431–2) in Kayseri, the Hamidid Dyndar Bey Medresesi (701/1301–2) of Egridir and the Ilkhanid Bimarhane (708/1308) of Amasya. The finely wrought Ak Medrese (812/1409–10) of Niğde is remarkable for its two-storey construction and for its balcony of Gothic-appearing bipartite arcades, rather like that of the Hüdavendigâr İmaretî at Bursa, across the second storey of the main façade. The large and traditional Zincirli Medrese (mid-fifteenth century) of Aksaray is notable for its four-*eyvan* plan.

Closed court *medreses*, although rather rare in the beylik period, derive like their open court counterparts from Seljuk models. The earliest beylik examples, the Ilkhanid Yakutiye (710/1310–11) and Ahmediye (714/1314–15) *medreses*, were built in Erzurum. Both have rectangular central courts covered with groin and barrel vaults recalling the hospital of Turan Melik (626/1228–9) in Divriği.




Figure 8.11 (a, b, c) Hatuniye Medrese, Karaman, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive), view of portal (Photo Bernard O'Kane) and view of courtyard (Photo Katharine Branning)

The Yakutiye in particular, with its fine, relief-carved portal, its façade originally flanked by a pair of brick minarets, and domed mausoleum at the back is reflective of the nearby Çifte Minareli Medrese dating to the mid-thirteenth century. Beylik period closed court *medreses* in central Anatolia are rather closer to the Konya tradition, with hemispherically domed courtyards recalling the Karatay (649/1251–2) and İnce Minareli (c.1265) *medreses*. Two such buildings were formerly found in Karaman. The first, the no longer extant Emir Musa Medresesi, was founded by Karamanoğlu Musa Paşa and dated to the middle years of the fourteenth century, while the second, identified by its foundation inscription as an *imaret*, though in form belonging to the closed court *medrese* type, was built by Karamanoğlu İbrahim Bey in 836/1432. A third closed court *medrese* of the Konya type dating to the early beylik period is the Vacidiye Medresesi in Kütahya (Fig. 8.12), in the principality of Germiyan. Local tradition holds the Vacidiye Medresesi to have been an observatory and connects it with a certain ‘Abd al-Wajid ibn Muhammad (d. 1434), a Khurasani authority on the religious and secular sciences, who is said to have settled in Kütahya during the reign of the Germiyanid ruler Süleyman Şah (1363–87). The foundation inscription on its portal, however, states that it was founded as a *medrese* in 714/1314 by one of the Germiyoğlu emirs, Yakub Bey I, Mubarizeddin Umur Savci, whose daughter was the mother of Yakub Bey II, using the *cizye* (poll-tax on non-Muslims) of Alaşehir.²⁰ Constructed of drafted sandstone, the *medrese* has in recent years been extensively restored. It is, nonetheless, clear that its plan was originally strictly symmetrical. The main façade has a three-tier arrangement with a rather simple but strongly projecting portal on the *medrese*’s longitudinal axis. An entrance hall, covered by a dome on squinches and flanked by a pair of small, barrel-vaulted rooms, gives access to the central courtyard covered by a 9.5 metre dome on Turkish triangles with a large oculi. A square pool occupies the centre of the courtyard, which is flanked on either side by three barrel-vaulted student rooms. At the back of the *medrese*, following an oft-repeated formula, a raised *eyvan* covered by a pointed barrel vault is flanked symmetrically by a further pair of domed rooms. Although the *eyvan* must originally have functioned as a classroom, it today contains a cenotaph (*sanduka*) said to be that of Molla Vacid (d. 1434), who served as *müderri* (teacher) of the *medrese*. Whether either of the rooms flanking the *eyvan* originally functioned as the mausoleum of the founder, Mubarizeddin Umur, is uncertain; no trace of a cenotaph can be seen in either. Overall, the *medrese* presents a rather plain and unadorned appearance, with relief-carved

²⁰ RCEA, 5346.





Figure 8.12 (a, b) Vacidiye Medresesi, Kütahya, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and view of courtyard and *eyvan* (Photo Katharine Branning)

decoration restricted to the portal and to a narrow frame around the *eyvan*. Formally, however, it adheres closely to the closed court *medrese* tradition of Konya and Çay of the second half of the previous century.²¹

Closed court *medreses* are virtually unknown in the Turkoman principalities of western Anatolia. A single Ottoman exception would seem to be that of Hacı Halil Paşa (the Haliliye Medresesi) (Fig. 8.13) in the town of Gümüş some 25 kilometres from Merzifon. Built by Halil Paşa, the emir of Gümüş Madeni who was later made *beylerbeyi* in 1413 by Çelebi Mehmed, it is constructed of rubble stone and brick and has a square plan with classrooms projecting from three of the four sides. Although the central courtyard is today enclosed by an arcaded portico carried on wooden columns, squinches filled with Turkish triangles found beneath the portico make clear the fact that originally the courtyard was covered by a dome measuring c.12.6 metres. Built, according to its inscriptions, between 816/1413 and 818/1415, the *medrese* is unique in Ottoman architecture, which favoured the open court *medrese* in the thirteenth-century tradition, albeit with minor variations.

Although a number of *medreses* are recorded as having been built in Bursa, İznik and Yenişehir in the reigns of Orhan Gazi and Murad I, only a handful survive, most notably the Lala Şahin Paşa Medresesi in Bursa, the Süleyman Paşa Medresesi in İznik, and the *medrese* in the second storey of Murad Hüdavendigâr's *imaret* at Çekirge. In all cases these are asymmetrical or anomalous buildings, and it is not until the reign of Yıldırım Bayezid that open court *medreses* of the type that was to become typical of Ottoman architecture are attested. Frequently these are built as part of larger religious and social complexes (*küllîye*), as is the case with Yıldırım Bayezid's *medrese* in his complex in the eastern suburbs of Bursa completed in c.802/1399–1400. A long, narrow rectangular structure, it was entered through an *eyvan* in the main façade covered by a dome atop a high, octagonal drum. The courtyard is enclosed on three sides by porticos behind which were ranged student cells. A square classroom, its floor two steps above the pavement of the courtyard, stood

21 The Hatuniye Medresesi is discussed in Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 55–66; Michael Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen seldschukischer Sakralbauten in Kleinasien* (Tübingen, 1976), pp. 165–70; Aptullah Kuran, 'Karamanlı Medreseleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 8 (1969), 216–17. For the Ermenak, Kayseri, Amasya and Aksaray *medreses*, see Kuran, 'Karamanlı Medreseleri'; also Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 20–4, 177; Gabriel MTA, 1, pp. 70–3; II, pp. 46–50. For the Yakutiye and Ahmediye *medreses* of Erzurum, see Ünal, *Erzurum*, pp. 32–57; the Emir Musa Medresesi and İbrahim Bey İmareti are discussed in Diez *et al.*, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 50–4, 67–84; also Kuran, 'Karamanlı Medreseleri', pp. 211–12. For the Vacidiye Medresesi, see Sayılı, 'The Wâjidiyya Madrasa'; also Metin Sözen, *Anadolu Medreseleri, Selçuklu ve Beylikler Devri*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1970–3), II, pp. 80–3.




Figure 8.13 Haliliye Medresesi, Gümüş, Merzifon, plan

opposite the entrance and was again covered with a large dome atop a high octagonal drum, mirroring the vaulting of the entry *eyvan*. Signs of a new Ottoman architectural style include the abandonment of the exaggerated decoration of the Seljuk gateways, the transformation of the classroom *eyvan* into a square room open to the courtyard and covered by a domical vault, and, from the exterior, the transformation of the block-like mass of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century *medreses* into a more articulated composition characterised in its covering by a rhythmic sequence of domes and chimneys.

Of all surviving early Ottoman *medreses*, it is that of Bursa's Muradiye complex (Fig. 8.14) that is the most attractive both in its proportions and in its sober and harmonious decoration. Situated immediately to the west of Murad II's




Figure 8.14 Muradiye Medresesi, Bursa, plan (after Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, p. 113)

mosque, the *medrese* is an Ottoman reworking of the traditional Anatolia open court *medrese* plan. A classroom at the back projects on the exterior beyond the south wall and opens on the north on to the rectangular central courtyard, the other three sides of which are enclosed by domed and groin-vaulted porticos. On the north a domed porch precedes the portal. Student cells distributed symmetrically along the east and west of the courtyard each contain a fireplace and niches set into the walls for personal possessions. These, as well as the service rooms ranged along the north side of the courtyard, are all vaulted. The classroom, the floor of which is raised eight steps above the level of the courtyard, is covered with a hemispheric dome on an octagonal drum carried on *muqarnas*-filled pendentives. Although harmoniously proportioned,

the most striking and attractive aspect of the *medrese* is the ornamental treatment of its masonry. Exterior and interior façades are for the most part constructed of alternating courses of brick and stone with more elaborate patterns worked out above the courtyard porticos and on the façades of the gateway and classroom. The nuanced and sober effect obtained through the utilisation of simple brick and stone contrasts pleasingly with the colours of the octagonal, turquoise-blue tiles used for the dado around the interior of the classroom.²²

Tombs

After mosques, it is commemorative architecture which is the single most common building type in thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Anatolia. These monuments were founded for essentially two categories of individuals: members of the ruling elite, that is, rulers, members of princely families, emirs and high state officials; and revered religious figures, including popular saints and, occasionally, honoured members of the *ulema*. Of the two groups, the former is by far the better represented in terms of the number of standing monuments, and is generally associated with the more outstanding examples of tomb architecture as well. This should come as no surprise, given the fact that it was the ruling elite who commanded the resources needed for ambitious architectural projects. It should be noted, however, that scale and elaboration of surface treatment aside, in formal and planning terms, the mausolea built by and for these two groups are essentially indistinguishable.

As in the Seljuk period, the tomb (*türbe*, *künbed*) architecture of the Turkoman principalities, with a few notable exceptions which obstinately refuse to fit any category, can be divided between the two basic types encountered in Iranian commemorative architecture: the tower tomb and the domed square or canopy tomb. Of the two, the tower tomb in its many variations is by far the more common in beylik Anatolia and is even more varied than in the Seljuk period. Nonetheless, the Anatolian Seljuk tradition is apparent in the proportions of these buildings in that they tend to be far less lofty than is the case with the tower tombs of the eastern Islamic world.

In both the beylik and early Ottoman periods, tomb architecture generally retains its centralising and vertical character. As in thirteenth-century Anatolia, mausolea consist of a cylindrical or polygonal shaft enclosing an uncompartimentalised room with one or more windows, entered through a single door.

22 For the Gümüş Medrese, see Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 171–7, with photographs of the squinches. For the *medrese* of Yıldırım Bayezid, see Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 73–4; Ayverdi, *OMİD*, pp. 447–54. For the Muradiye Medrese, see Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 112–14; Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 316–20.

Although these rooms often contain symbolic sarcophagi or cenotaphs (*sanduka*) and a *mihrab*, this is not unfailingly the case, suggesting that the main function of this space is not in fact to house any particular object, but rather to serve simply as an architectural interior. Generally, in beylik tombs the shaft is covered by a conical or polyhedral cap, while in those of the early Ottoman period, domical caps are more usual. Frequently, the shaft stands atop a square, rectangular or polygonal crypt (*mumyalık*) covered with a barrel vault, groin vault or dome, although such semi-subterranean chambers are not always present. In many cases, their presence cannot be definitively ascertained short of excavation, since frequently they do not have entrances. Where in fact a mausoleum marks an actual burial site and is not simply a commemorative cenotaph, the deceased is always interred in the ground, whether or not a crypt is present, and never in the *sanduka* found on the raised floor of the room within the tomb's shaft.

Typologically, it is the form of the shaft that more than any other feature serves to distinguish groups of mausolea from one another. The largest number of beylik tombs is polygonal in shape, most commonly octagonal, with pyramidal roofs. Unelaborated examples include the tombs of Zincirli Mehmed Paşa (779/1377) in Antalya, of Kalender Baba (c.1428) in Konya and the Hocendi or Büyük Türbe (c.1326) in Mut. In some instances monumental portals or porches are added to the entry façade, as in the Ali Cafer Türbesi (c.1350) in Kayseri, where this feature took the form of a small, enclosed vestibule, and the Eminüddin Türbesi (c.1452) in Karaman, which had a domed porch supported by columns. Perhaps the most spectacular of these octagonal tombs, one of the most outstanding among Anatolian mausolea, is the *türbe* of Hüdavend Hatun in Niğde (Fig. 8.15), the exterior surfaces of which are richly worked in geometric, vegetal and zoomorphic relief. Situated atop a low, octagonal base that may house a crypt, the tomb is covered by a pyramidal roof on the exterior and a hemispheric dome in the interior. The tomb chamber is reached by a double flight of three steps, and entered through an elaborately framed gateway that is mirrored in the decoration of the *mihrab* within. The three windows have pointed relieving arches above their lintels, the lunettes of which are filled with openwork screens of vegetal arabesque flanked in the spandrels by high-relief harpies, sphinxes and eagles. A dedicatory inscription identifies the person for whom the tomb was built as one of the daughters of the late Seljuk ruler Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV, Hüdavend Hatun, who is thought to have been the wife of a Mongol prince. Although the inscription states that the tomb was erected in 712/1312–13, the inscription on her cenotaph informs us that she did not die until 732/1331–2.




Figure 8.15 Hüdevend Hatun Türbesi, Niğde, general view (Photo Walter B. Denny)

While the largest number of polygonal funerary monuments of the beylik period is octagonal in plan, there exist a small number of pentagonal, hexagonal and dodecagonal tombs as well. These latter forms first make their appearance in Anatolia in the period of the emirates. The Yürük Dede Türbesi (late fourteenth century) in Ankara is a unique example of a pentagonal tomb, while the hexagonal type is represented by the *türbe* of Hızır Bey (mid-fourteenth century) belonging to the Taşkın Paşa complex in Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp. The dodecagonal plan is particularly associated with the Karakoyunlu in the region around Lake Van. Examples include the tombs of Halime Hatun (760/1358–9) in Gevaş and of Erzen Hatun (799/1396–7) in Ahlat. The mausoleum of Alaeddin Bey in Karaman (c.1388) is the only example of this type in central Anatolia. Funerary monuments with cylindrical shafts and conical caps are rather rare as well. Their origins are to be found in the regions of Erzurum and Ahlat and for the most part they date to the latter part of the thirteenth century.

Beylik-period examples include the Sırçalı Kümbet in Kayseri, an Eretnid tomb of the mid-fourteenth century, and the unique Akkoyunlu tomb of Zeynel Mirza (second half of the fifteenth century) at Hısn-i Keyf (Hasankeyf) on the Tigris in south-east Anatolia. This latter, a Timurid-appearing structure, built according to its inscription for Zeynel Bey, the son of Sultan Hasan Bahadır Han (presumably Akkoyunlu Uzun Hasan), is constructed of brick with square kufic renderings of the names of the Prophet and Rightly Guided Caliphs in blue-green glazed brick on its shaft, and is covered by a bulbous, Timurid-style dome.

Square tombs constitute a more complex and diversified group. The most common type has a square base supporting an octagonal drum with prismatic elements in the zone of transition resembling exposed squinches. Examples include the Ilkhanid Nureddin ibn Sentimur Türbesi (713/1314) in Tokat and the Karamanid tombs of Fakih Dede (860/1455–6) in Konya and of İbrahim Bey (868/1463–4) adjoining his *imaret* complex in Karaman. Far grander in scale but similar in plan are the tomb of Şeyh Hasan Bey, the emir of Eretna, in Sivas, known as the Gündük Minare (748/1347), with a system of exposed Turkish triangles around the zone of transition and a cylindrical shaft and conical roof, and those of Seyyid Mahmud Hayrani in Akşehir and Celaleddin Rumi in Konya. Both of the latter, though originally built in the Seljuk period, were rebuilt in their present form by the Karamanid emirs in the early fifteenth century and have great, fluted, cylindrical drums above square bases. Other examples of this square type of tower tomb, such as the Gündoğdu Türbesi (745/1344) in Niğde, have square bases with bevelled upper corners forming an octagon atop which is placed an octagonal drum. The most extraordinary variant on the square type, however, is the tomb of the fourteenth-century Turkish poet and mystic, Aşık Paşa (d. 733/1333) in Kırşehir (Fig. 8.16). Rectangular in plan, it consists of a vaulted entry hall along one of the sides of the tomb and a square tomb chamber covered by a hexagonal drum and dome on pendentives. Entrance into the tomb chamber is through a door in one of the long sides of the entry hall, requiring that the visitor turn through 90 degrees to pass from the entry hall into the tomb interior. It is the main façade of the building that, even more than the plan, is the tomb's most remarkable aspect, however. Veneered in marble, it is dominated in the Seljuk manner by a monumental portal projecting from the mausoleum's north-west corner. Curiously, although harking back to thirteenth-century antecedents in its composition, the portal is profoundly un-Seljuk in terms of the specific forms: a frame relief carved knotting in place of geometric interlacing and central niche headed by a fluted shell form in place of a *muqarnas*-filled semi-dome.



Figure 8.16 Aşık Paşa Türbesi, Kırşehir, general view (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive)

The result is a tomb absolutely unique in the context of Anatolian Turkish architecture.

In early Ottoman tomb architecture, in contrast to that of the other Turkoman principalities, it is variations on the domed square rather than the tower tomb that are most commonly encountered in the period before the middle of the fifteenth century. Although a tomb said to be that of Ertuğrul Gazi is located in Söğüt, and those of Osman Gazi and Orhan Gazi are located in the Hisar in Bursa, all are late reconstructions of earlier buildings ordered by sultans Abdülaziz and Abdülhamid II in the second half of the nineteenth century. The earliest surviving Ottoman tombs do, nonetheless, date to the reign of Orhan Gazi, and include those of Osman's son Çoban Bey, in Bursa, of Lala Şahin Paşa (c.749/1348) in Mustafakemalpaşa (Kirmastı) and, in all likelihood, the tomb known as the Kırızlar Türbesi (mid-fourteenth century) in İznik. These last two are particularly interesting because of their unique plans: a domed square tomb chamber preceded by a deep *eyvan*, an arrangement met nowhere else in Turkish Anatolian architecture.

More typically, early Ottoman tombs are characterised by square tomb chambers, frequently preceded by an open porch or small vestibule. Such, for example, was the case with the tombs of Yıldırım Bayezid and Gülçiçek Hatun, the wife of Murad I and mother of Bayezid I. Bayezid's tomb, one of

the dependencies of his social and religious complex in the eastern suburbs of Bursa, was initially built four years after his death by his son Emir Süleyman. It was subsequently sacked by the Karamanids in 1414, restored by Mehmed I before 1421 and renovated a second time following the great Bursa earthquake of 1855. Although the plan of the tomb as it stands today is surely original, there is some question as to whether the restored elevation is entirely true to the fifteenth-century original. There seems little question in this connection as regards the tomb of Sultan Murad II. Built as a dependency of the Muradiye complex in Bursa, it is dated by inscription to 855/1451 and adjoined on the east by the domed square tomb of three of Murad's sons, Alaeddin, Ahmed and Orhan. A large structure measuring 13.45 metres square, Murad's tomb is entered through a simple portal on the north under the projecting eaves of a painted and carved wooden porch of later date. In the interior, a barrel-vaulted ambulatory encloses a central bay containing the sultan's cenotaph and covered by a dome carried on a colonnade of alternating columns and piers. Interestingly, the dome has an oculus directly above Murad's cenotaph, a feature that, according to tradition, responds to the sultan's expressed desire that his mortal remains be watered by the rains. Overall, the tomb is striking for its sobriety and the absence of decoration, said to be a reflection of the sultan's pious nature.


In this respect, the tomb of Murad II stands in striking contrast to that of his immediate predecessor, Çelebi Mehmed, whose Yeşil Türbe or Green Tomb is surely one of the outstanding monuments of Ottoman Bursa. Forming part of Mehmed's social-religious complex, the tomb is distinct from Murad's not only in its lavish decoration, but in its form as well. An octagon in plan, it is much nearer the Seljuk and beylik norm than those of the other early Ottoman sultans. Built atop a stone crypt, the tomb is constructed of brick and stone with engaged piers of cut marble at the angles carrying pointed arches to form a blind arcade running around its eight sides. The shaft of the tomb is topped by an octagonal drum and is covered in turn by a hemispheric dome on a belt of Turkish triangles. Two rows of windows admit light into the interior and a simple cut-marble entrance enclosing a scalloped semi-dome rather similar in form to that of the Aşık Paşa Türbesi of the previous century in Kırşehir projects from the north façade. The exterior of the tomb is revetted in turquoise faience, with inscriptions in the tympana over the lower windows and floral patterns in the hood of the portal niche. This faience decoration is carried on into the interior of the tomb as well, where a turquoise dado enriched with floral medallions, a splendid *mihrab* and Mehmed's ceramic cenotaph are to

be found. The entire aesthetic, like that of Mehmed's nearby Yeşil Cami, is one closely related to Timurid Iran.²³

Civil and commercial architecture

Little of the diverse secular architecture of the Turkoman principalities has survived in its original form. Nonetheless, a scattering of fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century civil and commercial buildings do exist in various parts of Anatolia which serve to suggest something of the character of this architecture. Contemporary travellers mention a number of palaces belonging to Turkoman beys of central and western Anatolia. Ibn Battuta, for example, briefly describes the residences of the rulers of Menteşe and Aydın at Peçin and Birgi, and Bertrandon de la Broquière visited the palace of the ruler of Karaman at Konya and reports details of the Bey Sarayı in Bursa. Archaeological remains of fourteenth-century Turkoman palaces and pavilions (*köşk*) have been identified at Oba near Alanya, Aksaray, Niğde and at Peçin in the principality of Menteşe. Without question, the most imposing such structure, however, is the palace of Taşkın Paşa at Damsa Köyü near Ürgüp in central Anatolia (Fig. 8.17). Larger and more spacious than surviving Seljuk palaces, its plan bears more than a passing resemblance to that of a contemporary open court *medrese*, for which it was long mistaken. The palace is laid out symmetrically around a rectangular central courtyard with an *eyvan* opening off its south end. The entrance, a monumental gate in the Seljuk manner with a window in its upper part suggesting a second storey, is placed on the lateral axis of the building and is fashioned of carefully drafted, relief-carved limestone with bichrome voussoirs with joggled joints forming the gateway arch. Otherwise, the building is constructed of rubble masonry with the exception of the door and window frames of the rooms around the central courtyard and the room at the south-west corner, which is revetted with ashlar and contains a well-preserved stone *mihrab*. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the rooms were covered with vaults and it is assumed that they were roofed with thick wooden beams covered with earth. Located in a green and well-watered valley of gardens and vineyards at some distance from a fortified castle that dominates the district, the palace was probably the country residence of Taşkın Paşa,

23 See the sections on ceramics and woodcarving, pp. 341–4 and 350–1, below. For the typology of beylik tomb architecture, see Arık, *Anadolu*; for the Hüdavend Hatun Türbesi, Gabriel, *MTA*, 1, pp. 144–8; for the tomb of Murad II, Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 116–18; Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 321–7; for the Yeşil Türbe, Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 94–100; also Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 101–18.



(a)



(b)

Figure 8.17 (a, b) Taşkın Paşa Sarayı, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp, plan (Boğazici University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and general view (Bildarchiv/image archive Das Bild des Orients, Berlin, photo K. Otto-Dorn)

the builder of the mosque complex in the village of Damsa Köyü, about 3 kilometres distant. Although lacking a dated inscription, it would appear on both historical and stylistic grounds to date to the first half of the fourteenth century.²⁴

Among commercial buildings that survive from the beylik and early Ottoman periods are a number of *bedestans* or covered bazaars of a type that originally served (as the term indicates) as market halls for textiles, and later became general emporia for luxury goods. Although *bedestans* are mentioned in a number of thirteenth-century *vakfiyes* in such a way as to suggest that they were independent buildings, only one example, dating from the very end of the thirteenth century, the much repaired *bedestan* of Beyşehir built by Eşrefoğlu Süleyman Bey as a *vakıf* for his mosque, has survived to the present day. *Vakfiyes* list Turkoman-period *bedestans* among income-producing properties of pious foundations in Karaman, Niğde, Manisa and Tire. The still extant fourteenth-century *bedestan* of Tire, one of the *vakıfs* of the jurist İbni Melek, is a rectangular hall with four axial entrances, covered with eight cupolas arranged in two rows, and shops ranged around the outside. In contrast to the *bedestan* of Beyşehir, but in the manner of later Ottoman *bedestans*, it has rooms ranged around two sides of the interior as well.

A number of early Ottoman *bedestans* still survive in Bursa and Edirne as well. The *bedestan* of Edirne, among the finest in Turkey, was built by Çelebi Mehmed as a *vakıf* for the Eski Cami. It consists of a long rectangular hall with clerestory windows, covered by fourteen domes arranged in two rows. The interior of the hall, which is enclosed on all four sides with small stalls, can be entered, like the Tire *bedestan*, through four axial gateways. On the exterior, the *bedestan* is ringed by shops. Built of alternating courses of brick and stone, with monolithic relief-carved window arches, the building has an attractive appearance and in terms of planning is archetypal of Ottoman commercial buildings of this sort.²⁵

24 See K. Erdmann, 'Seraybauten des Dreizehnten und Vierzehnten Jahrhunderts in Anatolien', *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959), 89–90; Tahsin Özgüç, 'Monuments of the Period of Taşkin Paşa's Principality', *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca* (Naples, 1965), pp. 197–201; Diez et al., *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, pp. 188–90.

25 For the *bedestan* of Tire, see Mustafa Cezar, *Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical Period and the Ottoman Construction System* (Istanbul, 1983), pp. 162, 184–6; Riefstahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, p. 34; Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 196–9. As to references to *bedestans* in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century *vakfiyes*, see Cezar, *Commercial Buildings*, pp. 161–2; for the *bedestan* of Niğde, the *vakfiye* of Ali Bey Karamanoğlu (1415) for the Ak Medrese of Niğde mentions a *bezzazlar çarşısı*, and the wording of the documents points to its location as being that of the present *bedestan* near the Sungur Bey Camii. The present building is an *arasta* (covered market), which Gabriel thought dated to the seventeenth

Another type of commercial building, especially well represented at Bursa, is the *han*. Although the term is sometimes used synonymously with caravansary to designate a halting place built at stages along the main trade routes, in an urban context *han* is used to describe a kind of market building, usually devoted to trade in a particular commodity, or for merchants from a particular country or region. Generally square or rectangular in plan, *hans* are of two or more storeys and are characterised by a central courtyard enclosed by porticos. Rooms used for storage or as shops are set behind the porticos of the first storey while in the upper storeys similar rooms, often used as living quarters, are to be found. As these were primarily commercial buildings rather than caravansaries, little provision was made for the stabling of animals. External walls are pierced by windows and living quarters are provided with fireplaces. Access to the central courtyard is often through an imposing portal flanked by rooms for the gatekeepers in charge of the building. Outstanding examples in Bursa from the early Ottoman period include the so-called Bey Han (Emir Han) built by Orhan Gazi, dating to the mid-fourteenth century, and the early fifteenth-century Geyve Han and İpek Han, which were *vakıfs* of Mehmed I's Yeşil complex.

Under the emirates and early Ottomans there was no equivalent to the great caravansary building programme which the Seljuks had undertaken a century earlier for the development of the commercial routes across Anatolia. Those caravansaries that were built are for the most part modest in both scale and execution. In terms of planning, they perpetuate the three types – hall, courtyard and courtyard-hall – which distinguish the Seljuk caravansary. For example, a pair of ruined courtyard caravansaries at Balat (Miletus), said to date to the early fifteenth century, consist of open courtyards enclosed by stables and rooms for travellers. An irregularly laid-out structure of Karamanid date in the fortress of Alanya is thought to be a caravansary of the courtyard-hall type. It has a rectangular courtyard with rooms for travellers ranged around three sides of the interior and a large vaulted hall for animals and storage at the back. The Menteşeid Üçgöz (Karapaşa) Hanı at Peçin consists simply of a rectangular hall covered by barrel vaults with a doorway at one end. The oldest surviving Ottoman caravansary, the Issız Han (Fig. 8.18) on the shore of Lake Apolyont, 5 kilometres east of Ulubad on the road to Bursa, belongs to the same type. Its inscription dates it to 797/1394 and identifies the builder as Celaleddin Eyne Bey bin Felekeddin. Built of alternating courses of

century; see Gabriel, *MTA*, 1, p. 113. For the *bedestan* of Edirne, see Cezar, *Commercial Buildings*, pp. 172–4; Ayverdi, *ÇSMD*, pp. 162–3.




Figure 8.18 (a, b) Işsız Han, Ulubad, plan and general view of entry façade
(Photo Nurcan-Zeynep Abacı)

brick and stone, it is entered through one of the narrow ends via an *eyvan*-like portal flanked by a pair of rectangular rooms. The interior is divided by heavy stone piers into a central nave and side aisles and is illuminated by small windows high in the walls. Vaults are constructed of brick, as are a pair of huge hearths on stout, monolithic columns in the central nave surmounted by enormous brick chimneys. The great Yeni Han on the Tokat–Sivas road, with its peculiar plan consisting of an *arasta* or street of shops with stables placed symmetrically behind it on either side, despite an inscription which mentions Abu Said Bahadur Han and states that it was built in 730/1329–30, is in its present form substantially an Ottoman building, probably dating to the first half of the seventeenth century.²⁶

Materials, decoration and patronage

As noted above, not only do the pace and scale of architectural activity in the period of the emirates vary over time, but as between regions, specifics of form and planning do as well. Regional variation is characteristic of structure and materials as well. In this regard, the beylik-period architecture in central and east Anatolia is often characterised by a striking continuity vis-à-vis the preceding Seljuk period. In the principalities of Karaman and Eretna, for example, the principal building material continues to be carefully drafted stone set over a rubble core as in the Sungur Bey Camii in Niğde or the Yakutiye Medresesi in Erzurum. Brick is usually reserved for vaults and domes and for minarets, although at times it is used in quite dramatic ways, as is the case with the drum of the Gündük Minare in Sivas. Only rarely are buildings constructed substantially or entirely of brick. An instance of this is the Hasbey Darülhuffazı (824/1421) in Konya, and even here the brick walls are faced on three sides with cut stone, while the main façade is covered with a veneer of marble carved in an elaborate relief of geometric star entrelacs and braided motifs. This use of marble to revet façades or at least the portals of buildings, an innovation in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century architecture, is encountered elsewhere in central Anatolia, in the façades of the tomb of Aşık Paşa (c.733/1333) in Kırşehir and the portal of the Hatuniye Medresesi (783/1381–2) in Karaman.

26 For the caravansary of Alanya (if indeed that is what it is), see Riefstahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, p. 92; Seton Lloyd and D. Storm Rice, *Alanya (‘Ala’iyya)* (London, 1958), pp. 30–1; Cezar, *Commercial Buildings*, p. 162. For the Yeni Han, see Gabriel, *MTA*, II, pp. 167–8; Cezar, *Commercial Buildings*, pp. 148–9. The Issız Han is discussed in Umberto Scerrato, ‘An Early Ottoman Han near Lake Apolyont’, *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale de arte turca* (Naples, 1965), pp. 221–34.

Although drafted stone is the building material of choice in central and eastern Anatolia, it would be wrong to see fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Turkish architecture as simply a late continuation of the Seljuk tradition in this regard. The architecture of the west Anatolian beyliks in particular – Mentеше, Aydın, Saruhan, Osman – located in regions rich in Antique and Byzantine monuments and closely linked to the Mediterranean world, is strongly influenced in terms of materials by local building traditions. Thus, in place of drafted stone, construction is more frequently of alternating courses of brick and rough-cut stone, occasionally with façades of decoratively bonded brick work similar to those encountered in late Byzantine churches. Arches, vaults and saw-tooth moldings are in brick. Carefully drafted stone was used for column bases, capitals and doorjambs, where finely worked marble and sandstone were used. Cut stone was also used on the façades of porticos and eaves. Roofs were frequently covered with tiles such as are still to be seen on many of the monuments of İznik. Wood was used for window shutters, doors and tie beams. Rather more frequently than in central Anatolia, marble veneer, often spolia from Antique monuments, was applied to façades in the Roman and Byzantine manner in order to enhance the appearance of buildings constructed of otherwise rather common materials. Outstanding examples include the Ulu Cami (712/1312–13) and Aydınoğlu Gazi Mehmed Bey Türbesi (734/1334) of Birgi, the İsa Bey Camii (776/1375) at Ayasoluk (Ephesus), the Firuz Bey Camii (797/1394) of Milas and the İlyas Bey Camii (806/1404) in Balat (Miletus), and, in the Ottoman lands, the Ulu Cami (c.802/1399–1400) and Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20) of Bursa and the Yeşil Cami (794/1391–2) of İznik. Occasionally, bichrome (*ablak*) stone decoration as found in contemporary Mamluk architecture is encountered as well, as in the relieving arches over the windows of the west façade of the İsa Bey Mosque in Ayasoluk and the portals of the Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne.

Decoration is usually confined to entrances, doorways, *mihrabs* and other focal points. Decorative brick bonding was used in buildings such as the Orhan Gazi Camii in Bursa and the Nilüfer İmareti in İznik (790/1388–9) in a manner at times strikingly reminiscent of Byzantine work. Relief-carved geometric strapwork and vegetal arabesques are frequently found on portals and window frames, as is the case in the Yeşil Cami in Bursa and the İshak Bey Camii in Balat (Miletus). Relief-carved stuccowork continues an Anatolian tradition and can be seen in the *mihrabs* of the Yıldırım Camii and Şehadet Camii in Bursa. Finely worked stucco with vegetal reliefs is also applied to the niche- and fireplace-containing walls of the *tabhane* (hospice rooms) of buildings such as the Yıldırım Camii and Yeşil Cami in Bursa. Faience

continues to be used for the decoration of *mihrab*s, and is applied to interior and exterior façades in the form of dados or, in some instances, to highlight specific architectural features. Nowhere is it to be seen to better effect than in the Yeşil Cami and Yeşil Türbe in Bursa and the Muradiye Camii in Edirne.²⁷ Although only occasional traces survive, painting on plaster (*kalem işi*), usually consisting of vegetal compositions and inscriptions, was used to decorate interiors and can be seen to advantage in the Muradiye in Edirne.²⁸ Finally, carved and painted wood fittings are frequently found, as, for example, the wooden doors and shutters of the Yeşil complex in Bursa and of the Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne.²⁹

Fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century builders are particularly noteworthy for their experiments in planning and in the construction of vaulting, especially in western Anatolia. Foreign mosque plans are adapted to local needs as in the case of the İsa Bey Cami of Ayasoluk, based on the Great Mosque of Damascus, while the plan of the old Seljuk hypostyle *ulu cami* is rationalised and regularised in the Ulu Cami of Bursa and the Eski Cami of Edirne, with their multiple-domed bays of equal size. Porticos on the entry façades of mosques (*son cemaat yeri*) and courtyards before the prayer hall become with increasing frequency standard features of mosque planning. Although *medrese* architecture continues types defined in the thirteenth century, tomb architecture is striking for its variety as well as for its scale and sumptuousness. New formal arrangements such as the *zaviye*-mosque make their appearance in response to the growth of popular religious fraternities and changes in social structure. And bold experiments with domes of ever larger diameter are a striking feature of the period. The origin of this development would seem to be largely indigenous and is probably to be sought in Seljuk domed architecture of the thirteenth century. In western Anatolia, this initial interest in the construction of large domes seems to have been further stimulated by a desire in mosque architecture to emphasise the importance of the *mihrab* niche by placing an ever larger hemispherical vault before it (as in the Ulu Cami of Manisa), and by a desire to create an ever more unified interior space, as in the Üç Şerefeli Cami of Edirne with its enormous *mihrab* dome presaging the Ottoman imperial mosques of the later fifteenth and sixteenth century.

The patronage of architecture in the Anatolian *beyliks*, including the Ottoman principality, follows patterns already well established in the Seljuk state and in other Islamic lands in that it is closely associated with the ruling

²⁷ See the section on ceramics, pp. 339–46, below.

²⁸ See the section on painting, pp. 322–4, below.

²⁹ See the section on woodcarving, pp. 346–51, below.

houses of these states and with the important emirs constituting their ruling elites. Participation in these activities by members of the *ulema*, merchants and members of the artisan classes was restricted, no doubt, by the modest resources members of these groups had at their command. In the emirate of Aydın, for example, it was the *beys* of the principality, beginning with Gazi Mehmed Bey (1304–34) at Birgi, who are most notable as builders. Particularly outstanding was Gazi Mehmed Bey's son İsa Bey, who was initially governor of Ayasoluk (Ephesus) and later ruler of the entire principality. His foundations included a mosque and tomb in Birgi, a *zaviye* in Tire, and a pair of mosques (one being the great İsa Bey Camii), a tomb and a fountain in Ayasoluk. Among royal women, significant patrons include Hanzade Hatun (d. 1387), daughter of Gazi Mehmed Bey, Azize Hatun, the wife of İsa Bey, Gürce Melek, daughter of Umur Paşa, and Hafsa Hatun, the daughter of İsa Bey and wife of the Ottoman ruler Bayezid I. Hafsa Hatun's foundations include a mosque, *zaviye* and fountain in Tire, a fountain in the nearby village of Bademiye and a fountain in Birgi. Other patrons include various emirs of the *beys* of Aydın and members of the *ulema*, such as the jurist Ferišteoğlu İbni Melek, builder of a *medrese* and the *bedestan* of Tire.³⁰

In the Ottoman principality, it is again members of the ruling house, in particular the Ottoman sultans themselves, who are the most active builders. Although Murad II is the most lavish of early Ottoman builders in terms of scale and quality, he appears, rather surprisingly, to have been surpassed in terms of the overall quantity of his foundations by Orhan Gazi, who was especially active as a patron in towns such as Bursa, İznik and Bilecik. In terms of typology, it is mosques, in particular modest village mosques, that constitute Orhan Gazi's most numerous foundations, a fact not surprising, perhaps, given that his territories were only recently taken from the Byzantines. These were followed by educational and charitable foundations, *medreses*, and by *tekkes*, *zaviyes* and *imarets*. Although less active as patrons of building, Murad I's, Yıldırım Bayezid's and Çelebi Mehmed's most ambitious foundations – the Hüdavendigar, Yıldırım Bayezid and Yeşil complexes and the Ulu Cami of Bursa – far surpass those of Orhan both in size and in the excellence of their materials and workmanship. It is Murad II's complexes in Bursa and Edirne, however, the two Muradiyes and the Üç Şerefeli Mosque, that represent both in scale and, as regards the latter, in innovation, a climax to the early Ottoman period as a whole.

30 For the foundations of the principality of Aydın see Akın, *Aydınsoğulları*, pp. 216–20.

Significant patronage was also provided by other members of the Ottoman dynasty, including Orhan Gazi's brothers Alaeddin Bey (d. 1331) and Çoban Bey, and his son Gazi Süleyman Paşa; Murad I's sons Yakub Çelebi and Yahşi Bey; and Bayezid's sons Ertuğrul and Musa Çelebi. Similarly, royal women, including Orhan's wife Nilüfer Hatun, Gülçiçek Hatun (the wife of Murad I and mother of Bayezid I), Devlet Hatun (d. 1414, the wife of Bayezid I and daughter of Germiyanoglu Yakub Bey, who was also the mother of Mehmed I), and Hafsa Sultan and Selçuk Hatun (both daughters of Mehmed I) were important patrons of architecture. Among the early Ottoman emiral families, it was the Çandarlı who were the most outstanding builders through several generations beginning with Halil Hayreddin Bey, followed by Ali Paşa, İbrahim Paşa, Halil Paşa and Mahmud Çelebi. Their most important foundations are located in Bursa and İznik. Likewise Kara Timurtaş Paşa and his sons Oruç Bey, Umur Bey and Ali Bey were noteworthy patrons of architecture in Bursa, Edirne, Kütahya, Dimetoka and Manisa. Several members of the *ulema* seem also to have been important builders. They include the first Ottoman *şeyhülislâm*, Şemseddin Mehmed Fenari (d. 1431), Hafuzeddin Mehmed Efendi (d. 1424), the Hanifi jurist, and Amasyalı Sufi Bayezid, the tutor (*lala*) of Mehmed I. Finally, a scattering of foundations can be identified as being the work of members of the commercial and artisan classes, including the merchants Hacı Şihabeddin, who founded the Seyyid Nasir Mescid and Zaviye (before 855/1451), Hoca Sinan, who built the Boyacı Kulu Köprüsü (before 836/1443) in Bursa, and a Bezirgan Bedreddin, who built a caravansary near Denizli. As regards architects and artisans, Hacı İvaz Paşa, the architect of the Çelebi Mehmed Camii in Dimetoka and the Yeşil complex in Bursa (who was also for a time Mehmed I's grand *vezir*), built mosques in Ankara, Bursa and Tokat, while Nakkaş Ali, the decorator of the Yeşil Camii, built the mosque bearing his name inside the Hisar in Bursa.

The arts

The arts of the century and a half between the beginning of the fourteenth and the middle of the fifteenth century are very unevenly represented in the corpus of surviving artefacts, although a lack of objects is occasionally compensated for to a degree by other sources. While a number of finely carved wood furnishings and architectural fittings survive, and fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century pottery and ceramic developments are fairly well understood from excavated materials and the glazed tile decoration preserved in situ in architectural monuments, only a scattering of objects representative of the arts of the book

and of the textile arts have been preserved. Literary sources are of some help in reconstructing a more complex picture of the silk industry than known and dated objects might suggest, and scattered examples of manuscript illumination and architectural painting can be of some assistance in supplementing the very limited picture of book illustration in the period that could be had from the single known example that has come down to the present day. Metalwork remains a little explored area concerning which there has been considerable speculation in light of the number of significant objects in brass, bronze, steel and precious metals that survive from the Seljuk period. It is likely, therefore, that metalwork of artistic merit was produced in the beylik period, but until now only a handful of dated objects, including a silver inlaid bowl in the Mamluk style inscribed with the name and titles of Murad II, today in the Hermitage in St Petersburg (Hermitage NT 359), have been identified.³¹

Painting

Only four illustrated manuscripts of diverse provenance, disparate content and uneven quality survive from thirteenth-century Anatolia, far too few to permit discussion of a school of Anatolian Seljuk book painting. Manuscript illustration is even less well known with regard to the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and although rather unconvincing attempts have been made to attribute a group of paintings in the Istanbul Albums depicting demons, monsters, dervishes and nomads to eastern Anatolia,³² in fact not a single work can be attributed to the Turkoman emirates of the east. Literary sources refer to an atelier of painters at the Ottoman court in Edirne in the second quarter of the fifteenth century and praise the skill of the painter Husamzada Sunullah, but none of his work survives. An illuminated double frontispiece dated 838/1434–5 and dedicated to Murad II in a treatise on music, the *Maqasid al-Alhan* of Abdülkadir b. Gaybi al-Maragi,³³ hints at the high quality of contemporary work at Edirne.³⁴ That the atelier continued to function into the third quarter of the fifteenth century is clear from the copy of the *Dilsizname* of Badieddin al-Tabrizi in Oxford,³⁵

31 See A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, *Islamic Metalwork from the Iranian World, 8th–18th Centuries* (London, 1982), pp. 356–68; also J. S. Allan, 'From Tabriz to Siirt – Relocation of a Thirteenth-Century Metalworking School', *Iran* 16 (1978), 182–3.

32 See Bayhan Karamağarali, 'Anadolu'da XII–XVI Asırlardaki Tarikat ve Tekke Sanatı Hakkında', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 21 (1976), 247–84.

33 Topkapı Sarayı, R 1726.

34 See Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, *The Anatolian Civilizations*, vol. III: *Seljuk and Ottoman* (Istanbul, 1983), p. 107.

35 Bodleian Library, MS. Ouseley 133.

the colophon of which states that the manuscript was produced at Edirne in 860/1455–6.³⁶

Only a single manuscript, a text of the *İskendername* of Ahmedi, copied in Amasya in 819/1416 (Fig. 8.19),³⁷ three years after the author's death, serves to document the existence of Ottoman book illustration prior to the reign of Mehmed II. Although the manuscript is illustrated with twenty paintings, only three of these (folios 117v, 295v and 296v) are actually painted on the pages of the manuscript and so can be assumed to be contemporary with the copying of the text. All seventeen of the remaining illustrations are cut from two earlier manuscripts, one apparently with paintings in the mid-fourteenth century Ilkhanid style associated with the so-called small format *Shahnames* and the other in the Inju style of Shiraz. All the miniatures, both originals and those pasted into the text, are in poor condition, so it is difficult to establish their stylistic features. In terms of subject, the three original paintings depict groups of gold-nimbed riders set on blue or green grounds speckled with gold dots. Although Grube has seen a late Byzantine inspiration for these paintings, their most striking quality is perhaps their sheer primitiveness and lack of sophistication in terms of both composition and execution. The paintings do, nonetheless, betoken a demand for illustrated manuscripts at Amasya during the reign of Çelebi Mehmed, when the city enjoyed a considerable cultural and political prestige, and attest to the presence there of a painter of at least modest talent.³⁸

Although only three of the paintings in the Bibliothèque Nationale *İskendername* can be considered contemporary with the date given in its colophon, those paintings reused from earlier manuscripts are nonetheless enclosed in decorative frames of bold leafy and floral patterns characterised by the same gold speckled backgrounds as the three original paintings, suggesting that they are work of the same moment. It is interesting to note that these framing compositions, examples of the art of illumination (*tezhip*), bear a passing resemblance to some of the painted decoration in contemporary architectural monuments. This latter, generally executed on dry plaster in a kind of *fresco a secco*, is referred to generically as *kalem işi*, or brushwork painting. Although the technique must have been quite widely used in both beylik

36 Ivan Stchoukine, 'Miniatures turques du temps de Mohammad II', *Ars Asiatiques* 15 (1967), 47–50.

37 Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. Turc 309.

38 For Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. Turc 309, see Esin Atil, 'Ottoman Miniature Painting under Sultan Mehmed II', *Ars Orientalis* 9 (1973), 103–20; also Ernst J. Grube, 'Notes on Ottoman Painting in the Fifteenth Century', in *Essays in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Katharina Otto-Dorn*, ed. Abbas Daneshvari (Malibu, 1981), pp. 51–61.



Figure 8.19 *İskendername*, dated 819/1416, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, suppl. Turc 309, folio 117v (courtesy Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris)

and early Ottoman times, little of this work has survived the ravages of age and damp or the restorer's or whitewasher's brush. Nonetheless, fragments of such decorative programmes are still found in a number of fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century buildings. The earliest surviving Ottoman examples are in the drum of the dome of the mid-fourteenth-century Kırğızlar Türbesi in

İznik. Coloured red, black, yellow and green, they depict not only such classic motifs as arabesques of *rumi* leaves and blossoms on slender spiral stems, but unfamiliar elements such as vases and columns as well.

With this single exception, all other surviving examples of early Ottoman *kalem işi* would seem to pertain to the first half of the fifteenth century and can in most cases be dated with considerable precision. Significant examples have come to light in the Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20 with work on decoration continuing until 827/1424), as well as in the tomb of Şehzade Ahmed (c.1430) and the Hatuniye Türbesi (853/1449) in Bursa, in the Beylerbeyi Camii (832/1429) and Üç Şerefeli Cami (847–51/1443–7) in Edirne, and in the Yahşi Bey Camii (c.1440) in Tire. The finest surviving examples from the period, however, are located in the prayer hall and fountain court of the Edirne Muradiye (839/1436). Of the three painted layers, only the first can be dated to the period in question. Its iconography includes *naskhi*, *thuluth* and kufic inscriptions set against leafy arabesques and floral scrolls, ogival medallions filled with vegetal arabesques set against dense floral backgrounds, a paradisiac garden of cypress trees and flowering bushes on a flat ground (Fig. 8.20) and geometric interlace patterns placed in a floral ground. Forms are outlined in black on a red ground and are infilled in white, azure and yellow. That the paintings are contemporary with the founding of the mosque is established by the fact that the blue underglaze painted tiles of the prayer hall dado, which can be securely dated to the mid-fifteenth century by the presence of analogous tiles in the *mihrab*, overlap the painted decoration. Because so few examples of early *kalem işi* survive, it is not possible to say much about its stylistic development in the early Ottoman period. While later examples from the Classical period, such as the painted decoration of the Selimiye Camii in Edirne (1569–74), resemble contemporary textiles, earlier examples would seem to show a greater affinity to the art of illumination.³⁹

Textiles

Although the production of luxury textiles in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia is confirmed by numerous references in contemporary travels, histories and documents, little survives from the time in the form of actual woven fabrics. It is clear that silk production had for some time been associated with several places in Anatolia. In a well-known passage of his *Travels*, for

39 For *kalem işi*, see Elisabetta Gasparini, *Le pitture murali della Muradiye de Edirne* (Padua, 1985); Yıldız Demiriz, *Osmanlı Mimarisi'nde Süsleme, I, Erken Devir (1300–1453)* (Istanbul, 1979), pp. 23–4, and under specific buildings.



Figure 8.20 Detail, *kalem işi*, Muradiye, Edirne (Photo Walter B. Denny)

example, Marco Polo informs us that silk fabrics of crimson and other colours, as well as many other kinds of cloth, were woven in Anatolia, and earlier the Seljuk historian Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, in an enumeration of tribute gifts sent from the Seljuk court in Konya to the Ilkhanid ruler in 1258, mentions Antalya brocades (*kamkha-i Antali*).⁴⁰ Writing in the early fourteenth century, al-'Umari records that the principality of Akira (presumably Ankara) to the south of Sinop, on the northern border of the domains of Orhan Gazi, produced large quantities of silk which was the equal of Byzantine brocade and cloth of Constantinople.⁴¹ Other sources imply that silks were produced in Aydın in the early fourteenth century and that red silk stuffs were manufactured in

⁴⁰ Marco Polo, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, tr. and ed. Henry Yule (London, 1921), I, p. 43; Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr: Moğollar Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarih*, ed. O. Turan (Ankara, 1944), p. 62.

⁴¹ Al-'Umari, *Masalik al-absar, Al-'Umari's Bericht über Anatolien*, ed. F. Taeschner (Leipzig, 1929), p. 43.

Alaşehir (Philadelphia), then still under Byzantine control, during the reign of Murad I. Concerning more common textiles, Mustaufi states that cotton was produced in Sivas, Ankara, Erzincan, Konya and Malatya,⁴² and Ibn Battuta takes note of an unparalleled cotton cloth with borders of gold, renowned for the strength of its weaving and the quality of its cotton, named for the town of Ladik (the ancient Laodicea) in the upper reaches of the Menander near Denizli.⁴³

Just when the silk industry was established in Bursa is uncertain, although it seems clear from the fact that Orhan Gazi built a *bezzazistan* (drapers' market) in his capital in the middle of the fourteenth century that the textile trade must already have been of some importance. Such was certainly the case when Bertrandon de la Broquière passed through the city in 1432, for he notes that all sorts of silk materials as well as cotton stuffs were for sale in the bazaar of Bursa, although he does not state that the silks were actually produced locally. That the manufacture of silk textiles was already established in Bursa by the end of the fourteenth century, and its products were being exported to Europe, is confirmed by Schiltberger, who compares the city's silk trade and industry with that of Damascus and Caffa and adds that its products were sent from there to Venice and Lucca.⁴⁴

The raw silk used in the local manufacture of luxury textiles was not produced in Bursa itself, but was imported from the districts of Gilan and Mazandaran, south of the Caspian Sea in Iran. From there it was transported for the most part overland via Tabriz, Erzurum, and Erzincan to Bursa, where Persian traders established direct contacts with local and foreign merchants. Because of the strong demand for silk brocades, velvets and satins, and because the state treasury derived substantial revenues from the silk trade, it appears that the Ottomans pursued a conscious policy of establishing Bursa as a major entrepôt for Persian silk, and that this aim was at least in part the motivation behind the extension of their political and military authority eastward in the direction of Amasya, Tokat and Erzincan, and south toward Malatya, that is, along the silk routes out of Iran.⁴⁵

42 Mustaufi, *Geographical*, pp. 95, 98, 102.

43 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, p. 425. 44 Schiltberger, *Bondage and Travels*, p. 34.

45 Medieval literary references to textile production in Anatolia are collected by R. B. Serjeant, in 'Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest', *Ars Islamica* 15–16 (1951), pp. 57–9. The production of silks in Alaşehir is noted by Aşıkpaşazade, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur Hohen Pforte*, tr. Richard F. Kreutel (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1959), p. 87. For Aydın, see Pegolotti, *Fr Balducci Pegolotti, La Pratica della Mercature*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 208, 297, 300; H. İnalcık, 'Harir', in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2006) [henceforth *El2*], III, pp. 211–12. For Bertrandon de la

Although tantalising references to the silk trade in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia are to be found in the various literary sources, when it comes to actual woven textiles, almost nothing survives which can be securely attributed to the period. That this should be the case is at first glance, perhaps, surprising, given the existence of the enormous collection of royal garments and other textile pieces totalling some 2,500 items housed in the Topkapı Museum in Istanbul. Comprising ceremonial garments and embroideries, the collection had its origins in the Ottoman custom of bundling up the belongings of a deceased ruler or prince and preserving them in the palace treasury. Although this practice assured the preservation of these textiles, it in no way guaranteed that a proper recording of their date and ownership would be kept. Not surprisingly, inaccurate inventory lists, the mixing up of labels among bundles at times of periodic inspection and the often speculative attributions made by court officials resulted in a situation in which little reliance can be put on the court records concerning these materials. Despite this, the Turkish art historian Tahsin Öz, in a pioneering study of Turkish woven fabrics based on this collection, attributed to the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries a group of ten white cotton and silk kaftans, all with large floral patterns surrounded by long serrated leaves in silk and silver thread. In the light of present research, however, his attributions must be regarded as speculative at best.

To this questionable body of material there can be added a single silk brocade, found today in the treasury of the twelfth-century monastery of Studenica in Serbia, where it is held by popular tradition to have been the funeral pall of the Serbian king Stefan Prvovenčani, donated by Olivera-Despina, the younger daughter of the Serbian Prince Lazar, who was taken by Bayezid I as his wife after the battle of Kosovo in 1389. The organisation of the textile into a succession of stripes patterned alternately with geometric, floral and cloud band motifs and bands of calligraphy is distinct from that of the vast majority of later Ottoman textiles, but is frequently encountered in fourteenth-century luxury fabrics from Persia, Egypt, North Africa and Spain. Two inscriptions in *thuluth* on the pall repeat the invocations ‘the wise and just Sultan’ (*al-sultan al-‘alim al-‘adil*) and ‘Sultan Bayezid Han, may his victory be glorious’ (*Sultan Bayazid Han ‘azza nasruhu*), and when interpreted in the context of both the

Broquière’s comments, see *Voyage d’Outremer*, tr. Kline, p. 84; for Schiltberger, *Bondage and Travels*, p. 34. For the statement that by the end of the fourteenth century Bursa already possessed an industry in silk fabrics, see İnalcık, ‘Harir’, *Elz*, III, p. 216. For the Ottoman policy of promoting Bursa as a major entrepôt for Persian silk, see *ibid.*, p. 212; Nurhan Atasoy and Julian Raby, *İpek: The Crescent and the Rose: Imperial Ottoman Silks and Velvets* (London, 2001), pp. 155–9.

historical and stylistic evidence, would appear to refer to the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I. Although several of the motifs, most notably the flowers and cloud bands, derive from Chinese sources, and it is not impossible that the piece was produced by Chinese weavers for a Near Eastern patronage, the late Richard Ettinghausen argued persuasively that owing to its historical inscription, the richness of its decoration and its royal connections, the Studenica silk must be regarded as the outstanding example of late fourteenth-century Turkish textile arts.⁴⁶

Carpets

As compared with contemporary Turkish textiles, carpet weaving in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia is considerably better documented both by extant pieces and representations of carpets in contemporary European painting.⁴⁷ That fine carpets were made in thirteenth-century Anatolia is attested by Marco Polo (*tepedi ottimi e li piu belli del mondo*), who passed through the region in 1271,⁴⁸ and by the Mamluk historian and geographer Abu'l-Fida, who states on the authority of Ibn Sa'id (d. 1274) that Turkoman carpets were made in Aksaray.⁴⁹ Ibn Battuta, writing in the early fourteenth century, confirms this remark, asserting that, 'There are manufactured there [in Aksaray] the rugs of sheep's wool called after it, which have no equal in any country and they are exported from it to Syria, Egypt, Iraq, India, China and the lands of the Turks.'⁵⁰ In addition, Bertrandon de la

46 The kaftans in the Topkapı are numbered TKS 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 4640, 4641, 4642 and 4463 and are discussed and illustrated by Tahsin Öz in *Turkish Textiles and Velvets: XIV–XVI Centuries*, vol. I (Ankara, 1950), pp. 23–4 and 45, and illustrated in Plates I, II, IV. For a discussion of the Studenica pall, see Richard Ettinghausen, 'An Early Ottoman Textile', *First International Congress of Turkish Art, Communications* (Ankara, 1961), pp. 134–43; Atasoy and Raby, *İpek*, pp. 240, 253–4.

47 For general accounts of early Turkish carpets, see Wilhelm von Bode and Ernst Kühnel, *Antique Rugs from the Near East*, 4th edn, tr. Charles Grant Ellis (Ithaca, 1984); Kurt Erdmann, *The History of the Early Turkish Carpet*, tr. Robert Pinner (London, 1977); Erdmann, *Seven Hundred Years of Oriental Carpets*, ed. Hanna Erdmann, tr. May H. Beattie and Hildegard Herzog (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970); Şerare Yetkin, *Historical Turkish Carpets* (Istanbul, 1981). The Beyşehir carpets are discussed by Rudolf M. Riefstahl, 'Primitive Rugs of the "Konya" Type in the Mosque of Beyshehir', *The Art Bulletin* 13 (1931), 177–220; also Yanni Petsopoulos, 'Beyshehir IX', *Halı* 8 (1986), 56–8. For rugs from Divriği, Charles Grant Ellis, 'The Rugs from the Great Mosque of Divriği', *Halı* 1 (1978), 269–73. For the Anatolian animal carpets see C. J. Lamm, 'The Marby Rug and Some Other Fragments of Carpets Found in Egypt', *Svenska Örientsällskapets Arsbok* (1937), 51–130; Mackie, 'An Early Animal Rug at the Metropolitan Museum', *Halı* 12, 5 (1990), pp. 154–5; Şerare Yetkin, 'Yeni Bulunan Hayvan Figürlü Halıların Türk Halı Sanatındaki Yeri', *Sanat Tarih Yılılğı* [henceforth *STY*] 5 (1972–3), 291–307.

48 Marco Polo, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, I, p. 46.

49 Abu'l-Fida', *Taqwīm al-Buldān*, ed. T. Reinaud and M. de Slane (Paris, 1840), p. 379.

50 Ibn Battuta, *Travels*, II, pp. 432–3.

Broquière remarks that in 1432 he witnessed the way in which carpets were woven while travelling near İznik.⁵¹

The so-called Konya-type carpets are widely accepted as being of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century date. Examples of this type were first discovered by F. R. Martin in 1905 in the Alaeddin Camii in Konya. Additional fragments were subsequently found by R. M. Riefstahl in the Eşrefoğlu Camii in Beyşehir and in Fustat (old Cairo), the latter confirming Ibn Sa'īd and Ibn Battuta's statements that Anatolian carpets were exported to Egypt. The Konya pieces, three very large though damaged carpets and five smaller fragments, are all today in the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul,⁵² while two of the Beyşehir pieces are in the Mevlana Museum in Konya and the third is divided between the Keir Collection in London and a private collection in Germany. Eight Fustat fragments of the Konya type are dispersed among the National-museum in Stockholm, the Röhsska Konstslöjdmuseum in Göteborg and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. On the whole, these carpets are sufficiently well known as to require only some general comments. As a group they are characterised by wide borders with monumental pseudo-kufic characters or large stars, which contrast strongly with the field patterns composed of single small geometric motifs arranged in staggered rows, some isolated and others connected. The austerity of their design is reinforced by their sombre colour scheme of five to eight tints, including a medium and a dark shade of blue, a medium and dark red, yellow, ivory and dark brown. The carpets are entirely of wool but are not very finely woven, having an average density of seventy-seven symmetrical 'Turkish' knots to the square inch. Erdmann noted that given the dimensions of the three damaged full carpets from the Alaeddin Camii, the largest measuring some 2.85 by 5.50 metres, these could not have been the products of nomad or village weavers, but must have been done in urban workshops, since the looms on which they were woven had to have been more than 2.5 meters in width. Just where these workshops were located remains an unanswered question. Speculation as to whether these are the products of some sort of court workshop is inconclusive, though there is every reason to suppose that they were produced by weavers who catered to the needs of the ruling elite. While their provenance is generally agreed to be central Anatolia, the precise date of the Konya-type carpets remains something of a mystery. Indeed, they have been placed anywhere from the early thirteenth to the early fifteenth century. That rugs of this sort must

51 Bertrand de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d'Outremer de Bertrand de la Broquière*, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), p. 86.

52 Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, 678, 681, 684, 685, 688, 689, 692/3.



Figure 8.21 Konya carpet (TIEM 688) with motif from Yüan period Chinese silk damask, c.1300 (Photo Walter B. Denny)

have been produced well into the fourteenth century seems confirmed by TIEM 688 (Fig. 8.21), the pattern of which has been shown to derive from a type of Yüan silk damask found in Egyptian tombs dating to c.1300, while one of the Beyşehir fragments with a design of pendant palmettes in staggered

rows turned alternately left and right may even date to the early fifteenth century.⁵³

It is likely that production of Konya-type carpets overlapped chronologically that of a second type of Turkish carpet, designated by Erdmann the Anatolian animal carpet. These latter were apparently much admired in the west, to which they seem to have been exported in large quantities, for representations of animal carpets had already begun to turn up in the work of Sienese and Florentine painters in the first half of the fourteenth century, where they appear as coverings on floors, on the steps of thrones of the Madonna, on altars and tables, and hanging from balconies and windows. Since one must assume that the animal carpets would have been in production in Anatolia for some time before they found their way to Italy, it is probable that carpets of this sort had their origin no later than the last decades of the thirteenth century.

The rugs represented in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italian, Spanish and Netherlandish painting were carefully studied years ago by Wilhelm von Bode, Ernst Kühnel and Kurt Erdmann,⁵⁴ and are characterised by fields divided into rows of rectangles or squares with bevelled corners, in each of which is represented abstract and angular animal forms. The rectangles themselves are separated from one another by broad borders, the ornamental treatment of which in most paintings is either unrepresented or unintelligible. Typical fourteenth-century motifs include single birds or quadrupeds such as lions standing in the field rectangles. An example of the former can be seen in Niccolò di Buonacorso's *Marriage of the Virgin* (c.1370) in the National Gallery in London (Fig. 8.22), while stylised lions are depicted in the field squares of a fourteenth-century Sienese painting of the *Annunciation* formerly in the Schlossmuseum in Berlin, as well as in a contemporary painting of the *Marriage of the Virgin* by Giovanni di Paolo in the Galleria Doria in Rome. Later fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century paintings depict carpets with field panels filled with pairs of angular birds flanking severely stylised trees as in a *Marriage of the Virgin* by Sano di Pietro in the Pinacoteca Vaticana in Rome and

53 For a discussion of the connection between TIEM 688 and the Yüan silk damasks from Egypt, as well as of the Beyşehir carpet with pendant palmettes today divided between the Keir Collection and the private German collection, see Agnes Geijer, 'Some Thoughts on the Problems of Early Oriental Carpets', *Ars Orientalis* 5 (1963), 82–3.

54 See Kurt Erdmann, 'Orientalische Tierteppiche auf Bildern des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 50 (1929), 261–98; Erdmann, 'Neue orientalische Tierteppiche auf abendländischen Bildern des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 63 (1941), 121–6; John Mills, *Carpets in Pictures* (London, 1975); Mills, 'Early Animal Carpets in Western Paintings', *Hali* 1 (1978), 234–42.



Figure 8.22 Niccolò di Buonacorso, *Marriage of the Virgin* (c.1370), National Gallery, London, with Anatolian animal carpet (Copyright The National Gallery, London)

in a *Madonna and Child* by Giovanni di Paolo in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (41.190.16). In addition, from the early fifteenth century we find painted representations of carpets in which pairs of animals are presented side by side in a single rectangle as in a painting by Fra Angelico entitled *Enthroned Madonna with Saints* in the Museo di San Marco in Florence, or alternatively, in which two animals are shown in combat. The most famous depiction of

this latter theme is to be found in Domenico di Bartolo's *The Wedding of the Foundlings*, a fresco in the Hospital of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, dating to between 1440 and 1444. Significantly, in some of these depictions of later carpets the animals represented alternate from panel to panel.⁵⁵

A number of painted representations of Anatolian animal carpets, documents which are of particular value because many of the paintings can be dated with some precision, have been catalogued and the authenticity of these representations has been verified by reference to fragments of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Anatolian animal carpets found at Fustat and today in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Statens Historiska Museum in Stockholm and elsewhere. Nonetheless, surviving carpets and carpet fragments of this type are exceedingly rare. Three animal carpets or carpet fragments in Turkish museums⁵⁶ with zoomorphic motifs recalling those of the carpet depicted in a painting of the *Madonna and Child with Saints* by the fifteenth-century Catalan artist Jaume Huguet (Museo de Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona) are said to belong to this group and have been assigned a fifteenth-century date, although that attribution has not met with universal acceptance.⁵⁷ In addition, a recently acquired carpet in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (1990.61), with animal motifs similar to those depicted in a late fourteenth-century Sienese School painting of the *Marriage of the Virgin* in the National Gallery in London, has been dated to the fourteenth century.⁵⁸ However, the two most famous carpets of this type, one from an Italian, the other from a Swedish church, are to be found in European museums. The first (Fig. 8.23), a fragment purchased for the Berlin Museum by Wilhelm von Bode in 1890 from a Rome antique dealer and said to come from a church in central Italy, is surely one of the most widely discussed carpets in the whole of rug literature. Its field is divided into two large rectangles, each containing an octagon on which a stylised blue dragon and phoenix outlined in red

55 For detail showing the animal carpet of the Berlin Schlossmuseum *Annunciation*, see Erdmann, 'Orientalische Tierteppiche', Abb. 20; for Giovanni di Paolo's *Marriage of the Virgin*, see *ibid.*, Abb. 23; for Sano di Pietro's *Marriage of the Virgin*, see *ibid.*, Abb. 14; and for Giovanni di Paolo's *Madonna and Child*, see M. S. Dimand, *Oriental Rugs in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York, 1973), p. 175, fig. 143. A detail of the Fra Angelico *Enthroned Madonna with Saints* is found in Erdmann, 'Orientalische Tierteppiche', Abb. 26; of the Domenico di Bartolo, *Wedding of the Foundlings*, *ibid.*, Abb. 33.

56 TIEM 566, Istanbul Vakıflar Halı Müzesi, no. 1036, Konya Mevlana Müzesi, no. 841.

57 Erdmann, *Seven Hundred Years*, p. 49, agrees; Dimand, *Oriental Rugs*, p. 176, does not; Richard Ettinghausen, 'New Light on Early Animal Carpets', in *Aus der Welt der Islamischen Kunst. Festschrift für Ernst Kühnel* (Berlin, 1959), p. 112, says middle or late fifteenth century.

58 See Mackie, 'An Early Animal Rug', pp. 154–5; also Erdmann, 'Orientalische Tierteppiche', Abb. 22.



Figure 8.23 Animal carpet with struggling dragon and phoenix, c.1400,
Staatliche Museen, Berlin (Photo Walter B. Denny)

struggle against a yellow ground. The motif has origins in Chinese art and bears a striking resemblance to that on the carpet depicted by Domenico di Bartolo in Siena (referred to above), suggesting an early fifteenth-century date. The second carpet, known as the Marby Rug (Statens Historiska Museum 17786), was discovered by C. J. Lamm in a church in Marby in Jämtland, western Sweden, and is characterised by an overall field composition similar to that of

the Berlin carpet but with confronting cocks placed symmetrically on either side of a stylised tree, again against a yellow ground.

Woven in symmetrical ‘Turkish’ knots, Erdmann saw the Anatolian animal carpets as being related in terms of structure, colour range and wool quality to later Bergama carpets and hence localised their production to western Anatolia in the period between the end of the thirteenth and the middle of the fifteenth century. This was a region which until only recently had been under Byzantine rule, and it is possible therefore that some of the zoomorphic motifs found on the carpets were influenced by Byzantine textile design, although it is well established that silks with animal patterns had long been produced in the Islamic Near East where they were held in high regard for several centuries. From western Anatolia, with close commercial links to Genoa and Venice, animal carpets could have found their way to Italy without difficulty. Curiously, no examples of animal carpets with field compositions of the sort encountered in the Berlin and Stockholm rugs or depicted in the majority of Italian painted representations – that is, one or more stylised animals in square or rectangular field compartments – has been preserved in Anatolia itself, suggesting that these carpets may have been more popular in the west than in the land of their origin, where geometric and foliate forms may have been favoured. Indeed, it has even been suggested that Anatolian animal carpets were made up primarily for export and hence reflect a western rather than a Turkish taste. It should be noted, however, that depictions of animal carpets with stylised beasts in octagonal frames not unlike the Berlin and Marby rugs also appear in fourteenth-century Ilkhanid book illustration, as for instance in the painting of *Zahhak Enthroned*, today in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, from the mid-fourteenth-century Great Mongol *Shahname*, and that a well-known fragment of a field octagon containing a stylised bird found today in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (27.170.89) came from Fustat.

Finally, there is evidence that already in the fourteenth century two other types of rug were being woven in Anatolia alongside the Konya carpets and animal carpets. The first of these is known today from a surviving piece from Beyşehir (Riefstahl’s Beyşehir XII, today in the Mevlana Müzesi, Konya), dated to the early fifteenth century, as well as from fragments of similar carpets recovered from Fustat, while the second is documented by a handful of representations in Italian painting of the second half of the fourteenth century. These latter, including a pair of frescos of the School of Giotto, one at Assisi and the other in Santo Spirito in Prato, dating to the first half of the fourteenth century and a third fresco of the *Annunciation of the Virgin* in the church of Santa Maria

Nouvella in Florence from the end of the fourteenth century, depict carpets characterised by a division of the field into rectangles in a manner similar to the animal carpets, but different from the latter in that the rectangles are filled with geometric patterns rather than with zoomorphic motifs.⁵⁹ The Beyşehir carpet and Fustat fragments, on the other hand, have fields patterned with staggered rows of geometric and geometricised floriate motifs on a blue ground (Fig. 8.24). As such they should be seen as precursors of the later so-called Holbein carpets of Bergama and Uşak of the mid-fifteenth to late sixteenth century. That such carpets are unrecorded in European painting and, in so far as is known, are not preserved in any European collection suggests that, just as the zoomorphic carpets may well have been made for export, the geometric rugs were possibly manufactured for a domestic market. Perversely, if such is the case, the nature of the evidence has ensured that the carpets made for a foreign taste are today better known than those fashioned for local consumption.

Ceramics

The common ware glazed pottery types associated with the Seljuk period in Anatolia continued to be produced into the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.⁶⁰ Finds at İznik, for example, including sgraffito wares, slip painted earthenwares covered with clear as well as turquoise or brown glaze, and black underglaze painted wares under a turquoise glaze, all types known from Kalehisar, Beyşehir and elsewhere in Anatolia, suggest that the techniques for their production had been introduced into Bithynia by the Ottomans in the early fourteenth century. In addition to these, a new, distinctively Turkish glazed common pottery makes its appearance in the fourteenth century. Known as 'Miletus ware', it is characterised by a red or buff earthenware body covered by a white slip painted in cobalt blue, turquoise, green, purple and black usually under a clear lead glaze. Motifs range from simple stem, leaf and flower motifs to geometric patterns and naturalistic bird forms set in leafy fields. Because

⁵⁹ For the Assisi and Prato frescos, see Kurt Erdmann, *Oriental Carpets: an Account of their History*, tr. Charles Grant Ellis (Fishguard, 1976), figs. 17, 18; for the fresco in Santa Maria Novella, Florence, see Erdmann, *History*, fig. 25.

⁶⁰ For early Ottoman ceramics see John Carswell, 'Six Tiles', in *Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, ed. Richard Ettinghausen (New York, 1972), pp. 99–124 (on Master of Tabriz tiles of Muradiye and the tomb of Sultan Cem plus Syrian analogies); Carswell and Dowsett, 'Ceramics', in *Tulips, Arabesques and Turbans: Decorative Arts from the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Yanni Petsopoulos (New York, 1982), pp. 73–114; Arthur Lane, 'The Ottoman Pottery of İznik', *Ars Orientalis* 2 (1957), 247–81; Rudolf M. Riefstahl, 'Early Turkish Tile Revetments in Edirne', *Ars Islamica* 4 (1937), 249–81; Tahsin Öz, *Turkish Ceramics* (Ankara, n.d.); Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen*; Nurhan Atasoy and Julian Raby, *İznik: the Pottery of Ottoman Turkey* (London and New York, 1989), pp. 82–9.




Figure 8.24 Proto-Holbein carpet from Beyşehir (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, no. 841) (Photo Walter B. Denny)

fragments of this pottery were first found on the islands of the Aegean, the earliest published accounts referred to it as 'Island Ware'. Quantities of it were also found by Th. Weigand in the course of his excavations at Miletus (Balat) and, given that area's long history as a centre for the production of pottery, it was assumed to be a local product despite the fact that no kilns were found with which its manufacture could be associated. In fact, 'Miletus wares' have subsequently turned up at many sites, not only in Anatolia but also in the southern Balkans, including Afyon, Amasya, Antalya, Athens, Bergama, Bursa, Edirne, Istanbul, Karaçahisar, Konya, Malatya, Sardis, Selçuk, Seyitgazi, Silifke and Yalova, and more significantly, kilns and wasters have been found at Kütahya, at Akcaalan near Ezine in the Troad, and at İznik. The İznik kilns, excavated by Oktay Aslanapa in the 1960s, make clear the fact that the latter town, in particular, was an important centre for the production of 'Miletus ware'. It must be assumed, nonetheless, that common wares of this sort were produced over a wide area in western and central Anatolia and perhaps the south-eastern Balkans as well.⁶¹

Although the various sub-groupings of 'Miletus wares' await systematic classification, it is nonetheless clear that the term covers a range of stylistic and technical types and undoubtedly refers to a lengthy production. Its appearance in post-conquest contexts in Istanbul establishes the fact that it continued in use into the early decades of the sixteenth century, but the date of its initial production remains ill defined. In terms of decoration, the geometric and radial designs of the 'Miletus wares' suggest possible links with fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Syrian pottery, while some of the plant motifs seem to have links to fourteenth-century Chinese blue-and-white porcelain. It is significant that Byzantine influence seems to be entirely absent from its painted decoration. 'Miletus ware' would thus appear to be an unsophisticated and mass-produced pottery of a local west Anatolian ceramic industry ranging in date from the mid-fourteenth to the early sixteenth century. It is important to note, however, that neither in technique nor in style does this pottery have anything in common with the luxury frit wares, which begin to be produced in İznik under court patronage from the latter half of the fifteenth century.⁶²

61 For sgraffito, slip painted earthenwares and black underglaze painted wares from İznik, see Oktay Aslanapa, 'İznik Kazılarında Ele Geçen Keramikler ve Çini Fırınları', *Türk San'atı Tarihi Araştırma ve İncelemeleri*, vol. II, ed. Behçet Ünsal and Nejat Diyarbakırlı (Istanbul, 1969), Lev. 1/1, 1, 2; Aslanapa, *Anadolu'da Türk Çini ve Keramik Sanatı* (Istanbul, 1965), Lev. 18, 19. For 'Miletus ware' see *ibid.*, Lev. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23–31.

62 For 'Miletus wares', F. Sarre, 'Die Keramik der islamischen Zeit von Milet', in *Das Islamische Milet*, ed. Wulzinger *et al.*, pp. 109–88; Oktay Aslanapa, *Türkische Fliesen und Keramik in Anatolien* (Istanbul, 1965); Aslanapa, 'Pottery and Kilns from the İznik Excavations',



Figure 8.25 *Mihrab*, Ulu Cami of Birgi, 712/1312–13 (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive)

The use of faience as architectural decoration in the Anatolian emirates, while continuing a Seljuk tradition, is with the exception of a handful of monuments far less ambitious than in the preceding century. As can be seen from the *mihrab* of the Ulu Cami of Birgi (712/1312–13) (Fig. 8.25), in terms

in *Forschungen zur Kunst Asiens: In Memoriam Kurt Erdmann* (Istanbul, 1969), pp. 140–6; Aslanapa, *Türk Sanatı*, 2 vols. (1969), II, pp. 62–73; M. Paker, 'Anadolu Beylikler Devri Keramik Sanatı', *STY* 1 (1964–5), 155–66.

of technique, colour scheme and motifs, there is little to distinguish beylik-period work from that of the thirteenth century. Other notable examples of Seljuk-style cut tile used for beylik-period architectural decoration are the interior of the dome of the tomb of Gazi Mehmed Bey (734/1334) at Birgi, the pendentives of the *mihrab* bay of the İsa Bey Camii (776/1375) at Ayasoluk and the *mihrab* of the Hasbey Darülhuffaz (824/1421) in Konya. Turquoise or green glazed brick is worked into geometric patterns on the shafts of the minarets of the Yakutiye Medresesi (710/1310–11) in Erzurum and the Ulu Cami (778/1376) of Manisa, and on the drum of the Gündük Minare (748/1347) in Sivas. On the whole, however, as compared with the glories of Seljuk architectural faience of the previous century, the beylik period is one of scattered efforts and decline, mirroring perhaps the diminished resources available for such purposes.

The earliest Ottoman use of faience and glazed brick for architectural decoration dates back to the end of the fourteenth century and is to be found on the shaft of the minaret of the Yeşil Cami (780–94/1378/9–91/2) in İznik, which is completely revetted with cut tile and glazed bricks. Despite the minaret's catastrophic restoration using modern Kütahya tiles in the early 1960s, it remains clear that the İznik minaret continues in the tradition of Seljuk glazed brick and faience decorated minarets of the thirteenth century. Its shaft, covered with a zigzag pattern of glazed bricks, is framed by borders of intersecting octagons and braided and geometric star patterns, and is surmounted by a balcony carried on moulded faience *muqarnas*. The dominant colour is green, to which fact, obviously, the mosque's name is to be attributed, but tiles of turquoise, cobalt, purple and yellow were used as well.

Although monochrome tiles in turquoise and cobalt were used a few years later in the decoration of the Yıldırım Bayezid's mosque and hospital (c.793–802/1390–1399/1400) in Bursa, the most magnificent ensemble of early Ottoman ceramic decoration is to be found in the mosque and tomb of the Yeşil complex (822–7/1419–24) of Mehmed I. Tile-revetted areas in the mosque include the *mihrab* niche, dados around the main and side *eyvans*, the flanking *tabhanes*, the two *mahfils* at the back of the fountain court, and the upper-storey imperial tribune (*hünkâr mahfili*) and flanking ante-chambers and balconies. In the case of the tomb, both exterior and interior are enriched with faience decoration. On its exterior, broad expanses of turquoise faience contrast dramatically with the epigraphic tympana above the windows and the exuberant calligraphic and vegetal decoration of the portal niche (Fig. 8.26), while the interior, dominated by a splendid faience *mihrab*, is enriched as well by a turquoise dado with great arabesque medallions,



Figure 8.26 Yeşil Türbe, Bursa, general view of exterior (Photo Walter B. Denny)

and a magnificent tiled cenotaph atop a high plinth (Fig. 8.27). The tiled revetments of the Yeşil complex are noteworthy not only for the scale on which the work was carried out, but also for the range of techniques used in the project. Indeed, three techniques can be identified. Two of these, veneers of monochrome glazed turquoise, green and blue tile and cut-tile faience mosaic, hark back to the Seljuk tradition of ceramic architectural decoration of the thirteenth century. To these, however, a new technique was added, one that has its origins in Timurid Iran. Known as *cuerda seca* ('dry cord'), it involved the decoration of a single tile in glazes of several colours, a technique made possible by outlining the design on the ceramic body in thin lines using a greasy black pigment. Glazes of different colours applied within these contours were thus prevented from running together.



Figure 8.27 *Mihrab* and cenotaph (*sanduka*), Yeşil Türbe, Bursa (Photo Walter B. Denny)

It is significant that the *cuerda seca* technique was unknown to either the Seljuks or the Ottomans before the construction of the Yeşil complex. As such Mehmed's foundation must be seen, not only in its scale and sumptuousness, but also in terms of technology, as an important point of departure in the history of Ottoman art. While *cuerda seca* tiles are not encountered in Anatolia before this date, they had already, as early as the 1360s, been used in Timurid Central Asia in the decoration of the tombs of the Shah-i Zinda in Samarkand, where, after 1385, they were juxtaposed with work in cut-tile mosaic, possibly introduced to the Timurid capital by craftsmen brought from what had been Seljuk Anatolia and Ilkhanid Azerbaijan. The juxtaposition in Mehmed's foundation of *cuerda seca* tiles with ceramic techniques long established in Anatolia thus suggests the involvement of craftsmen familiar with Timurid tilework, a supposition confirmed by a Persian inscription on the mosque's *mihrab* identifying it as 'The work of the Masters of Tabriz'.

Further evidence for the involvement of Persian craftsmen in the decoration of the Yeşil complex is to be found in a signature on one of the tomb's wooden doors, stating that it is 'The work of Ali bin Hacı Ahmed of Tabriz', and in an inscription dated 827/1424 over the mosque's imperial tribune containing the name of Ali bin İlyas Ali, who apparently functioned as the overseer of the entire decorative programme. This latter person, known from other sources

as Nakkaş Ali (Ali the Designer), was a native of Bursa who had been carried off to Transoxiana by Timur in 1402. There he evidently became familiar with the Timurid style and in time, returning to Bursa, was instrumental in transmitting aspects of Timurid design and visual culture back into his homeland. It is also noteworthy that, according to the historian Aşıkpaşazade, the sultan's *vezir*, İvaz Paşa, who was both administrative overseer and architect of the Yeşil complex, brought craftsmen from Acem, that is from Iran, to work on it.

Timurid influence is also suggested by the range of colours employed in the tilework of the Yeşil complex and by the style of its decoration. Thus, in addition to the turquoise and eggplant purple of Seljuk tilework, yellow, green, white and a matt red are used. Likewise, new and richer styles of decoration make their appearance, in particular spiralling leafy compositions with convoluted cloud bands and the stylised lotus blossoms sometimes referred to as *hatayî* or Cathayan. Deriving directly from the orientalising international Timurid art of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, these elements are played off against arabesques of split leaf palmettes and elongated pointed foliage connected by slender, undulating stems in the *rumi* style, and geometric borders and bands of calligraphy. Indeed, the entire aesthetic of Mehmed's tomb is Timurid in the manner of Samarkand and Herat. And yet if foreign influence is strongly felt in design, in range of colours, in glazing techniques and in decorative motifs, it is significant that the tiles themselves are indisputably the work of local potters, for in their fabrics of red earthenware covered with white slip and lead glaze, they have no connection whatsoever with the white frit tiles of Iran, but rather, are identical to contemporary 'Miletus wares'.

Thus, the ambitious use of glazed ceramic as architectural decoration, which had fallen into decline in fourteenth-century Anatolia, experienced a sudden revival at the beginning of the fifteenth century. That this revival was the work of an atelier of foreign craftsmen who identified themselves as the 'Masters of Tabriz' is clear both from epigraphy and from the tile-making techniques that they used. It is further apparent that the 'Masters of Tabriz' were not only involved with Mehmed I's great building programme, but continued in the service of the Ottoman sultans for the next half-century. Although some of their work is to be found in Bursa, in the mosque and *medrese* of the Muradiye complex (828–30/1425–6), beginning around 1429 the key focus of their activity appears to have shifted to Edirne. Here they were involved in the decoration of the Şahmelek Camii (832/1429), and most significantly in Murad's two key monuments in that city, the Muradiye Camii (839/1436) and the Üç Şerefeli Cami (847–51/1443–7). In the former, tiles are used to revet the enormous




Figure 8.28 Muradiye, Edirne, detail of dado showing hexagonal blue-and-white tiles
(Photo Anthony Welch)

mihrab and the dado running around the three sides of the *mihrab* bay. The former, executed largely in *cuerda seca* tiles, bears such a striking resemblance to the *mihrab* of the Yeşil Cami in Bursa that there can be little question but that it too is the work of the same craftsmen.

At the same time, the Muradiye testifies to significant changes in the technical range of the 'Masters of Tabriz'. The use of cut tile seems to have been abandoned by them after 1425, while in the Muradiye a new type of cobalt blue-and-white underglaze painted tile is introduced. This latter is encountered most strikingly in the dado of blue-and-white hexagonal and turquoise green triangular tiles (Fig. 8.28) and is worthy of note for several reasons. First, these are the earliest examples not only of underglaze painted tile but also of blue-and-white ceramic to be produced by the Ottomans; and second, they are the earliest Ottoman ceramics to be produced with white frit bodies. Significantly, the frit fabric, while similar in appearance to that of later İznik wares, was produced using an alkaline frit technology typical of Iran rather than the lead frit that is typical of later İznik pottery.

Among the 479 blue-and-white hexagonal tiles of the dado, 53 distinct painted types can be identified. A number of these are geometric and radial compositions derived from the repertoire of Islamic design, but the majority are inspired by Chinese blue-and-white wares of the Yuan and early Ming periods. Chinoiserie forms encountered on these tiles include a type of distinctive lobed and pointed leaf with pairs of spikes on either side familiar from fourteenth-century Chinese porcelain, and lotus flowers, often outlined in the Chinese manner on slender, sometimes curved or undulating stems, inspired by early fifteenth-century Chinese blue-and-white wares.

Curiously, the tiles of the dado friezes are a later addition to the mosque. This is shown by the fact that fragments of the painted (*kalem işi*) decoration which originally covered the full elevation of the walls of the *mihrab* bay have been found behind the dado tiles, making it clear that the latter were not part of the Muradiye's original decoration but were applied at some later date. Just when that might have been is uncertain, but the blue-and-white hexagonal tiles must have been produced by the same workshop as the *mihrab* and hence be of approximately the same date as the mosque since moulded *muqarnas* prisms in the frame and the border frieze of the *cuerda seca mihrab* are done in underglaze blue-and-white.

The 'Masters of Tabriz' were also involved in the decoration of Murad II's Üç Şerefeli Mosque, where they were commissioned to produce eighteen tiled tympana for the windows of the courtyard. Only two of these have survived. That they were the work of the 'Masters of Tabriz' is apparent from their frames of running floral scrolls that are similar to those framing the dado in the Muradiye. The fields of the two surviving lunettes are practically the same, consisting of dramatic inscriptions in soaring *thuluth* script interlaced with smaller inscriptions in an angular kufic, set against a background of spiral stems and *rumi* leaves. Here the Tabrizi potters have abandoned the *cuerda seca* technique and substituted for it a new polychrome underglaze painted colour scheme in turquoise, cobalt blue and manganese purple which, however, replicates to some degree the *cuerda seca* colour scheme.

The workshop of the 'Masters of Tabriz' continued to function into the years following the conquest of Constantinople, as is clear from the presence of two similar tympana in the courtyard of the Fatih Mosque in Istanbul, built between 1463 and 1470. While reminiscent of the Edirne panels in design, they are notably different in one respect, namely the inclusion of yellow in the palette of underglaze painted colours. That the workshop of the 'Masters of Tabriz' survived as late as the end of the 1470s seems apparent from an examination of the so-called Tomb of Cem Sultan (884/1479) in Bursa, for although the

workmanship of the blue and purple underglaze tiles in the dado borders and tympana is of distinctly lesser quality than is that of the Muradiye tiles, their designs – split palmettes in the borders, geometric motifs and palmettes on the octagonal tiles of the tympana – clearly continue in a design tradition having origins forty years earlier. Following the completion of the Tomb of Sultan Cem, the production of underglaze painted frit tiles comes to an end in western Turkey until revived in the second decade of the sixteenth century. By that time, however, the workshop of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ was no longer in existence, for not only are the colour scheme and design of these tiles, now associated with the potteries of early sixteenth-century İznik, distinct from those of the Tabriz potters, but the technology is one based on the use of the lead frit preferred by Turkey rather than the alkaline frit used by the Iranian craftsmen and their followers.

Woodcarving

Woodcarving⁶³ occupies an important place among the Turkish arts of Anatolia. Careful workmanship was lavished on architectural fittings and furnishings, including *minbers*, lecterns (*rahle*), doors, window shutters, columns, capitals, beams and consoles. Generally, these furnishings are fashioned of hard woods, most especially of walnut, but also of apple, pear, cedar, ebony and rosewood. While in general the woodwork of the beylik and early Ottoman periods follows closely the tradition of the preceding Seljuk period, a few new departures do manifest themselves in both technique and style. These include not only the incorporation into the wood craftsmen’s repertoire of pattern new motifs such as the *hatayi* blossom from the international Timurid style, but also the first tentative use of wood and bone inlay, a technique which appears in Cairo at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century and which was to become especially important in the Ottoman art of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

63 Woodwork of the beylik and early Ottoman periods is discussed in Gönül Öney, ‘Anadolu’da Selçuklu ve Beylikler Devri Ahşap Teknikleri’, *STY* 3 (1969–70), 135–49; Demiriz, *Osmanlı Mimarisi’nde Süsleme, I, Erken Devir*, with general overview on pp. 24–6, followed by discussion of various specific monuments; Halûk Karamağaralı, ‘Çorum Ulu Câmiindeki Minber’, *STY* 1 (1964–5), 120–42; Ömür Bakirer, ‘Ürgüp’ün Damsa Köyü’ndeki Taşkın Paşa Camii’nin Ahşap Mihrabı’, *Belleten* 35 (1971), 367–82 (with English summary); M. Zeki Oral, ‘Anadolu’da San’at Değeri Olan Ahşap Minberler, Kitabeleri ve Tarihçeleri’, *Vakıflar Dergisi* 5 (1962), 23–78. For the development of ivory, bone and wood inlay in Egypt, see E. Kühnel, ‘Der Mamlukische Kassettenstil’, *Kunst des Orients* 1 (1950), 55–68.

Of the techniques most commonly employed by the woodworker, either alone or in combination with one another, the simplest involved the relief carving of various motifs and profiles into a single plank. It was a technique used especially for smaller architectural fittings such as shutters and the doors of *minbers*, but required wood of high quality, without defects, and had as a drawback the tendency of furnishings fashioned in this manner to warp or split as they dried. To counteract this tendency, a second technique, that of tongue-and-groove construction (*kündekari*), was used. Tongue-and-groove construction seems to have developed in the twelfth century and appears in Anatolia at about the same time as in late Fatimid Egypt and Syria. Favoured for the construction of *mihrabs* and doors with their broad, flat surfaces, *kündekari* furnishings and fittings are made up of tongue-edged panels of polygonal or stellate shape carved with arabesque relief, which are then fitted into grooved frames. Because the grain of the panels runs in directions different from that of the frame, warping is retarded and cracking or splitting counteracted. True *kündekari* places high demands on the joiner's skill, however, and as a result a third technique, sometimes referred to as false *kündekari*, was developed, whereby whole planks were carved in relief with the stellate and polygonal patterns of true *kündekari* and were then mounted on the framework of a *minber* or other piece of furniture with pins. In some rare instances, strips of wood imitating in appearance the narrow frames of true *kündekari* panels were nailed or glued into the channels between the relief carving on these planks as well. Although the visual effect is that of true *kündekari*, this 'false *kündekari*' suffered from the same warping and splitting as furnishings cut from a single plank.

A surprisingly large number of outstanding fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century *minbers* and wooden architectural fittings bear inscriptions giving the names and titles – *neccar* or *derüdger* (carpenter) or as *nakkaş* (decorator) – of the craftsmen who made them. In some cases, these inscriptions serve to identify families through which the craft was transmitted. Muzafferredin b. Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, who fashioned the *minber* of the Ulu Cami of Birgi in 722/1322 at the command of Mehmed Bey, the emir of Aydın, for example, was apparently the son of the carpenter (*neccar*) Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, who carved a lectern (*rahle*) of an unspecified date in the thirteenth century now in the Islamic Museum in Berlin (No. J. 584). In other instances, several works can be attributed by these inscriptions to a single craftsman. Thus, Hacı Muhammed b. Abdülaziz bin al-Dakı is known for two wooden *minbers*, that of the Ulu Cami of Manisa, made by order of the Saruhanid ruler Çelebi İshak b. İlyas in 788/1376–7 following the design (*kataba khattahu wa rasama naqshahu*)

of a certain Yusuf b. Fakih, and that of the Ulu Cami of Bursa, executed at the command of Sultan Bayezid b. Murad Han in 802/1399–1400. The *nakkaş* Abdullah b. Mahmud worked in Kastamonu and Ankara during the second half of the fourteenth century and is known for four works spanning a quarter-century: a wooden cenotaph for the mausoleum of Ahi Şerafeddin in Ankara dated in Receb 751/September 1350; the doors of the mosque of İbn Neccar in Kastamonu dated 9 Zilhicce 758/23 November 1357; the doors of the mosque of Mahmud Bey at Kasaba Köyü in the vicinity of Kastamonu, dated Ramazan 768/May 1367, and those of the Mahmud Bey Camii at Ilisu, dated 776/1374–5.

An outstanding example of a beylik *minber* done in the true *kündekari* technique is that of the Sungur Bey Camii in Niğde (736/1335–6), now in the Diş Cami in the same town, the work of Ebubekr b. Muallim. False *kündekari* work can be seen in the unique wooden *mihrab* of the mosque of Taşkın Paşa in Damsa Köyü dating to the middle of the fourteenth century, today in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara, and the *minber* of the Ulu Cami of Çorum, dated 10 Safer 706/22 August 1306, signed by two craftsmen who identify themselves by their *nisbas* as having links with Ankara, Davud bin Abdullah and Muhammed bin Ebubekr. Earlier work by the latter is found in the *minbers* of two late thirteenth-century mosques in Ankara, the Arslanhane Camii and the no longer extant Kızıl Bey Mescidi (the latter *minber* today in pieces in the Ethnographic Museum). From a technical point of view, the *minber* of the Taşkın Paşa Camii in Damsa Köyü (mid-fourteenth century) (Fig. 8.29) and the inner door of the Türbe of Hacı Bayram Veli from Ankara (early fifteenth century), both today in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara, are of special interest for the fact that they combine bone and wood inlay. In the former the inlay is found in a pair of rosettes in hexagonal frames in the spandrels of its gateway, while in the latter it is used in the stars and polygons filling the geometric strapwork on its face.

The earliest example of Ottoman woodcarving is a shutter of the Orhan Camii in Gebze, dating to the mid-fourteenth century. Consisting of three walnut panels in a frame of the same wood, it is a rather unambitious example of true *kündekari*, carved in a single plane of relief. This arrangement into three panels, so typical of beylik and Ottoman shutters and doors, is encountered also on the leaves of the main door of the Bayezid Paşa Camii in Amasya (817/1414). While the upper panels of the two leaves are filled with calligraphy, the large rectangular panels in the middle of each leaf is inscribed in its upper part and filled with an infinite pattern based on a twelve-pointed star below. Finally, the bottom panels are decorated with infinite patterns of palmettes. Like



Figure 8.29 *Minber* bone inlay, Taşkın Paşa Camii, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp (today in the Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara) (Photo Walter B. Denny)



Figure 8.30 *Kündekari* wooden door, Yeşil Türbe, Bursa (Photo Walter B. Denny)

the Gebze shutter, the Amasya doors are made of walnut, which, however, is worked in two broad planks and is carved in a rounded relief.

It is the doors and shutters of Çelebi Mehmed's Yeşil complex in Bursa that from the technical, artistic and historical point of view must be regarded as the outstanding examples of the woodcarver's art from the period. The doors of the Yeşil Türbe (Fig. 8.30) are especially noteworthy, not only because they can be approximately dated by the portal inscription on the tomb (Cemaziyelevvel 824/May 1421), but because they are inscribed with the name of the woodworker who fashioned them, Hacı Ali bin Ahmed al-Tabrizi, no doubt one of the Persian craftsmen brought to Bursa by İvaz Paşa, the architect of the

Yeşil complex, to work on Mehmed's foundation. Fashioned from walnut in true *kündekari*, the doors follow the standard formula, being divided into three panels set in an inscribed frame. The upper panels are filled with geometri-cised patterns of rosettes carved with leafy arabesques, while the lower two are constructed of geometric star arrangements. Although different in detail from the doors and window shutters of the Yeşil Cami, the latter are for the most part sufficiently similar to the former both in technique and in specific motifs to suggest that all are the work of the same master.

Conclusions

The century and a half from the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century – the beylik and early Ottoman periods in Turkish art – is a moment of transition from, on the one hand, the artistic traditions of the Anatolian Seljuks which had been given their classical expression in the thirteenth century, and, on the other, the first Ottoman court style developed under Mehmed II in the 1460s and 1470s, following the conquest of Constantinople. Both as regards architecture and the arts, it is a period of experiment and eclecticism, tendencies reinforced by the political divisions of Anatolia among ambitious and competing emirates that sought to use the arts to enhance their political legitimacy and prestige, and promote an image of power and authority. While in central Anatolia traditions inherited from the Seljuks retained their hold through most of the fourteenth century, in western Anatolia notions carried over from the Seljuks were joined to ideas, techniques and vocabularies derived from the Byzantines, from Mamluk Egypt and from the Iranian world. Although the material resources available to the Anatolian emirates put limits on the scale and ambition of their architectural programmes and on their involvement in the luxury crafts, it is nonetheless true that among the many modest efforts of fourteenth-century architects and craftsmen, occasional monuments of true originality and taste were produced. By the early fifteenth century, this experimentation had led to a significant flowering of the arts in the Ottoman principality in particular, where a new, increasingly architectonic architecture was supplanting the old façade-style building of the Seljuks, a new white frit glazed ceramic tradition made its appearance, and the first stirrings of the arts associated with the illustrated manuscript book can be discerned. While carpet chronology is still fraught with unresolved problems, it appears that the Konya-type carpets had gradually given way to the new Anatolian animal carpet and to geometric types such as the proto-Holbeins of European painting. As regards the silk industry, a conscious Ottoman policy

of state encouragement appears to have set Bursa on the course to becoming a major centre of the luxury textile trade.

The experiments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries were finally, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, to give rise to a new, officially inspired and imperially sponsored art and architecture in the second half of the fifteenth century. With the transfer of the capital to Istanbul and the resettlement of the city with populations brought from Anatolia and the Balkans, architectural programmes, which in scale and ambition were only hinted at by the monuments of Bursa and Edirne, were undertaken by Fatih and his successors. The Fatih complex, with its regular planning and imposing dimensions, and the New Palace of Mehmed II on Seraglio Point were metaphors for a new, bureaucratised and hierarchical, universal order. At the same time, the process of borrowing and experimentation, the sifting through of vocabularies and typologies inherited from the past, taken over from neighbouring cultural traditions and incubated in the emirates over the previous century and a half reached a moment of synthesis. While parts of this inheritance were discarded, others became central features of a new style, promoted by imperial patrons, shaped and refined by designers associated with the imperial *nakkaşhane* (design studio), and realised in the work of a host of skilled architects and craftsmen who could draw on the material resources of what had now become a world empire.

Social, cultural and intellectual life, 1071–1453

AHMET YAŞAR OCAK

It is no easy task to write the social, cultural and intellectual history of Turkey between 1071 and 1453. Although the period is a long one, the material in the official chronicles is relatively limited. While we do possess information for the political history, the same unfortunately cannot be said for the social, cultural and intellectual life of the period since most of the sources we do have, the majority of which have been translated into western languages, deal with political history. Despite this difficulty, however, valuable information can be obtained from various sources, including travel books, even if their number is limited, literature, epics and hagiographies which shed light on different aspects of the subject.¹ It nevertheless remains true that, presuming new sources do not come to light, it will continue to be very difficult to construct a clear or complete picture of the social and cultural life of the period with the exception, perhaps, of subjects such as science, literature, Sufism and art.

If we exclude the *vakfiye* (endowment deeds of *vakıfs*, pious foundations) of the Seljuk and Ilkhan periods copied in the Ottoman period,² it is clear that archival material of the type found in the Ottoman archives and which was without doubt also produced both in Seljuk Anatolia and in the period of Ilkhan domination has unfortunately not survived from those earlier periods. Such documents must either have disappeared during the plunder and destruction of the first period of the Mongol invasion or, together with those documents

¹ The various types of local sources for Anatolia in the Seljuk period were made known and analysed many years ago by Fuad Köprülü in a detailed article, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları I', *Belleten* 7, 27 (1943), 379–425.

² Examples of such *vakfiyes* belonging to the Seljuk and Mongol period have been published by Osman Turan and Ahmet Temir in various issues of *Belleten*. See, for example, Osman Turan, 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri I: Şemseddin Altun-Aba Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı', *Belleten* II, 42 (1947), 197–235; Turan, 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri II: Mübarizeddin Er-Tokuş ve Vakfiyesi', *Belleten* II, 43 (1947), 415–29; Turan, 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri III: Celaleddin Karatay, Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', *Belleten* 12, 45 (1948), 17–170; Ahmet Temir, *Kırşehir Emiri Nur el-Din'in 1272 Tarihli Arapça-Moğolca Vakfiyesi* (Ankara, 1959).

produced by the Ilkhans, were burnt and destroyed in the course of the various uprisings and pillaging by the Turkomans who sought revenge against the Seljuk and Mongol administration. This is a substantial loss for the history of the period and creates a gap in our knowledge which cannot be filled. It is this lack of sources which led some historians, such as V. Gordlevsky for example, to attempt to analyse various economic and institutional aspects of the Seljuk and beylik periods by working backwards from the Ottoman period and by using Ottoman documents as an analogy for earlier practices.

In this chapter we shall examine the social, cultural and intellectual life of the period under five main headings. After giving a historical introduction to the political history of the period, setting the subject in its historical context, we shall consider social and ethnic structure; religion; science; thought; and intellectual life.

From Asia Minor to Turkey

Anatolia, the site of the modern Turkish Republic today, has been known by many names over the centuries. Anatolia (the country where the sun rose) in ancient times, it was known as Asia in the Roman and the first Christian periods, and then as Asia Minor. For the Arabs in the early Middle Ages it was *Bilad al-Rum* (the land of the Rum). The Europeans in the later Middle Ages called it Turchia because in that period much of the region had passed under Turkish domination and had been largely settled by Turks. It was also more commonly known by the names used for the provinces which it had formed in the Roman and Byzantine periods. In the classical Ottoman period these two names, Anatolia (Anadolu in Turkish) and *Bilad al-Rum*, were used for two large *eyalets* (administrative divisions), *Eyalet-i Anadolu* and *Eyalet-i Rum*.³

During its history, Anatolia underwent four important political, ethnic, socio-cultural and religious transformations, in other words fundamental civilisational and cultural changes, in succession: Hellenisation, Romanisation, Christianisation and finally Islamisation. From the beginning of the nineteenth century it underwent another period of change, westernisation, for which some use the term *çağdaşlaşma* (*muâsırlaşma* in Ottoman Turkish), 'becoming

3 Turks today use both the 'Anatolia' of the classical period, in the form *Anadolu*, and the 'Turchia' of the Middle Ages in the form *Türkiye*. They never use the names Asia Minor or *Bilad al-Rum*. In the end, as we can see, the name *Türkiye* took over in the official name of the modern-day Turkish state, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, the Turkish Republic. *Anadolu* is more geographic, *Türkiye* more political, ethnic and cultural in meaning. The old Roman term, Asia Minor, is generally preferred by western historians.

contemporary', a period which represents the most important civilisational and cultural change in Turkish history since the acceptance of Islam.

In the eleventh century, at the time of the appearance of Turkish invaders, Anatolia was under the rule of the Eastern Roman Empire, as the Byzantine Empire was known. Byzantium was locked in a political struggle with the Sassanid Empire in Iran which resulted in frequent and lengthy wars between the two states. These wars, which ended with victory sometimes for one side, sometimes for the other, negatively affected the internal politics of both empires, and served to weaken them both. Although these wars were motivated by a desire to capture territory and to establish dominion, they were perhaps driven even more by a desire to take control of the trade routes linking east and west and to secure commercial revenue-producing sources, for the economic base of both empires rested on the typical classical agricultural economy. Apart from the wars with the Sassanids, the Byzantine Empire also suffered endless and draining succession struggles among the ruling families, and the frequent changes which resulted from these rocked Byzantium and left it further weakened internally. By the eleventh century when the Turks arrived, Byzantium was no longer the strong empire which it had been in the time of Justinian (527–65) or Heraklios (610–41).⁴

As is well known, the Roman emperor Constantine the Great (311–37) began one of the most important transformations in the history of the Mediterranean basin by bringing Christianity under his protection. This, and the declaration of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire in 391 in the time of Theodosios, resulted in the spread of Christianity, backed as it was by political force. This transformation was speeded up by the establishment of the city of Constantinople and, immediately after the death of Theodosios in 395, resulted in the separation of the empire into two. Now Anatolia was officially a Christian region under the control of the Eastern Roman Empire.

The ethnically very mixed population of Anatolia was by no means, however, all Orthodox, and there were various small churches described as 'heretical' to be found there. The Byzantine central administration applied heavy financial, political and religious pressure to these churches, in particular imposing high levels of taxation on them. While such pressure was designed to ensure their disappearance, it produced completely the opposite result: the members of these churches usually chose to come to an agreement with the invaders

4 For the political position in Byzantium before the Turkish invasion see, for example, V. Ostrogorsky, *Histoire de l'état byzantin* (Paris, 1956); A. A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1932; repr. 1969); L. Brehier, *Vie et mort de Byzance*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1969).

and to join them in fighting against the Byzantines. Thus in the Ummayyad and Abbasid periods the members of these 'heretical' churches in general gave their support to the Arabs in the military campaigns they undertook into Anatolia.

The first step in the process of the familiarisation of Anatolia with the Turks and Islam was the battle of Dandanakan in 1040. This battle, fought between the Gaznevids and the Seljuks, resulted in the settling of the Seljuks in Iran and the consequent founding of an empire, that of the Iranian Seljuks. A new Seljuk state was created in Anatolia by Seljuk expansion from Iran, and it was this state under the Seljuks, called Anatolian or Turkish Seljuks by modern Turkish historians, which affected almost every political, ethnic, social and religious aspect of this process of familiarisation. Of the four periods of transformation listed above, this was one of the most radical in the history of the region. In political terms, it pushed the frontiers of Byzantium back to western Anatolia; in ethnic terms, it drove different Turkish groups, the most significant being the Muslim Oğuz (Turkomans), into the region where they settled and began a process of Turkification; in social terms, it created a totally new society in Anatolia; and in religious terms it became symbolic of Islam, the religion they brought with them and which they made the religion of the area.

The Turkish invasion of Anatolia, undertaken with the aim of settling there, was not the result of any Seljuk policy of conquest or expansion, but was driven by internal political developments within Iran and was, for this reason, an event brought about by necessity rather than one of the Turks' own choosing.⁵ We know that the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt in Turkish) in August 1071 was not a battle into which the Great Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan (1063–72) entered with the intention of invading Anatolia, but was an encounter forced upon him by the attack of Emperor Romanos Diogenes at the time of the military campaign against the Fatimids. Therefore, at the end of the battle Alp Arslan came to an agreement with Romanos Diogenes. The sultan released the emperor whom he had taken prisoner, restored all his rights to him and did not take over the territory.⁶

5 See Claude Cahen, 'La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure (seconde moitié du XI^e siècle)', *Byzantion* 18 (1946–1948), 5–67, which considers this question in detail. See also Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London, 1968), pp. 66–9; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane* (Istanbul and Paris, 1988), pp. 83–5; O. Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye* (Istanbul, 1971), pp. 37–44.

6 See Claude Cahen, 'La campagne de Manzikert d'après les sources musulmanes', *Byzantion* 9 (1934), 613–42; Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 27–31; S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, 1971), pp. 96–103.

To understand the invasion and conquest of Anatolia by the Turks, it is necessary to see it in relation to the policy adopted by the Seljuk administration of Iran in its attempt to impose control over and settle the Turkoman tribes who represented a threat to regional order as they moved constantly from Central Asia into Iran and caused disruption. In order to rid themselves of these troublesome tribes, the Seljuk rulers made no attempt to prevent their organising raids into Anatolia, then under Byzantine control; on the contrary, they even encouraged them.

Following the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt), Turkoman leaders (*beys*) such as the Artuk, Saltuk, Danişmend and Mengücek *beys*, conquered lands in Anatolia and set up a number of small states there: the Saltuks in Erzurum, the Mengüceks in the region of Erzincan and Sivas, the Danişmends in the region of Tokat, Niksar and Malatya, and the Artukid state around Mardin and Harput.⁷ The Danişmend conquests in Anatolia created great admiration among the Turks of the time and was the subject of a large anonymous epic called the *Danişmendname* which described the conquests.⁸

Apart from these small beyliks, the major state which occupied almost all of Anatolia with the exception of the Aegean and Marmara regions was created by the Turkoman *beys*, relations of the Great Seljuk dynasty in Iran. Kutalmış's unsuccessful claim to the sultanate in Iran resulted in his being unable to take refuge in Iran, and his being driven from there into Anatolia. Kutalmış's son Süleyman did not intend to remain permanently in Anatolia, hoping instead to settle matters with his relations in Iran. The Iranian administration was, however, determined not to allow them back into Iran.⁹

Driven out of Iran, the Turkomans were thus forced by the political situation to settle permanently in Anatolia.¹⁰ In 1081 Süleyman took İznik (Nicaea) from the Byzantines and made it his capital, and thus established the Anatolian

7 Apart from several articles written about these states, there are only two monographs, both written by Turkish historians: O. Turan, *Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi: Saltuklular, Mengüçkiler, Sökmenliler, Dılmaçoğulları ve Artuklular'ın Siyasi Tarih ve Medeniyetleri* (Istanbul, 1973); F. Sümer, *Selçuklular Devrinde Doğu Anadolu'da Türk Beylikleri* (Ankara, 1990).

8 See Ş. Akkaya, *Kitâb-ı Melik Danişmend Gazi: Eine Türkische Historischer Heldenroman aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Ankara, 1954); I. Mélikoff (ed. and tr.), *La Geste de Melik Danişmend: étude critique du Danişmendnâme* (Paris, 1960).

9 Z. V. Togan, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş* (Istanbul, 1970), pp. 202–3; Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 103–33.

10 Claude Cahen, 'Notes pour l'histoire des Turcomans d'Asie Mineure au XIIIe siècle', *Journal Asiatique* 239 (1951), 335–54.

Seljuk state.¹¹ Three years later, Antakya was taken. The Turks were now permanently settled on Anatolian soil, never to leave.¹²

The establishment of the Seljuk state was not a particularly easy process. While the Turks struggled with Byzantium on the one hand, they also fought the Danişmends, another Turkish state which had control of part of central and eastern Anatolia, on the other. The reign of Kılıç Arslan I (1092–1107), the son of Süleyman, was one of conflict with the Byzantines, the Danişmends and the crusaders. Surrendering to the crusaders who besieged İznik in 1096, this courageous sultan withdrew eastwards. In 1106 he took Malatya from the Danişmends and in 1107 he conquered Mosul, but he was eventually defeated by Emir Çavul and drowned in the Habur river. His son Mesud (1116–56) took Konya from the crusaders and made it the centre of the state. His successor, Kılıç Arslan II (1156–92), who, too, fought against the crusaders, inflicted a heavy defeat on the Byzantines at the battle of Myriokephalon (Karamikbeli in Turkish) in 1176. With this battle the permanent settlement of the Turks was secured. The dream of the Anatolian Seljuks to return once more to Iran and to take control of the state there was ended. Another important development in the same period was the Seljuk removal of the Danişmend state in 1178, which resulted in more than two-thirds of Anatolia coming under Seljuk domination.¹³ Before the death of Kılıç Arslan II the state was divided between his sons in accordance with the old Turkish tradition. It was during the period of struggle between them for supremacy that the third crusade of 1189 occurred. Despite this, the Seljuks successfully defended their territory against the crusaders. In the end İzzeddin Keykavus I (1210–20) emerged successful from the power struggles with his brothers and ascended the Seljuk throne alone. In 1204 the crusaders of the fourth crusade captured Constantinople and set up the Latin state there, forcing the Byzantines into exile in the region of İznik.

During the reigns of İzzeddin Keykavus I and, in particular, of his brother Alaeddin Keykubad I (1220–37), the Anatolian Seljuk state made considerable political and economic advances. Taking the harbours of Sinop on the Black Sea coast and Antalya (Attaleia) on the Mediterranean, the Seljuks obtained control of important trade routes. With the ensuing revenue from international trade, the Anatolian Seljuks were able to increase further the social and economic

11 Historians are not agreed on the date of the establishment of the Anatolian Seljuk state, some, for various reasons, regarding it as having been set up in 1075, some in 1081.

12 Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 191–200.

13 For the various phases of the history of the Anatolian Seljuks see Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, and Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*.

affluence of the region, which had in any case by now reached a certain level of prosperity.¹⁴ It is at this time that the Sufi and philosopher Shihab al-din al-Suhrawardi and, after him, the famous Andalusian mystic Muhieddin İbn Arabi came to Anatolia.

This period of affluence did not, however, last long. Under the despotic and incompetent rule of Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II (1237–43) the order of the Anatolian Seljuk state began to break down. After the great Turkoman rebellion, the Babai revolt of 1240, which represents an important turning point in medieval Turkish history,¹⁵ the Mongols moved easily into Anatolia and the period of an independent Anatolian Seljuk state came to an end.¹⁶ Wishing to benefit from this situation, the Vatican sent Dominican and Franciscan missionaries to Anatolia with the aim of converting the shamanist Mongols to Christianity and imposing this religion once more on the region. One of these Dominican missionaries, Simon de Saint-Quentin, has left an interesting account of the social and religious life of the Mongols in Anatolia in this period.¹⁷ It was at this time that the Latin state came to an end with the Byzantines of İznik once more taking Constantinople. This period was one of successive political and social crises and revolts in the Seljuk lands of Anatolia. It was in this environment that the famous mystic Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi lived in Konya.

After 1277 the Mongols took over the administration in Anatolia. Escaping from Mongol pressure and pursuit, the Turkoman tribes fled towards the Byzantine frontiers in the west where they began to set up small states on the lands they conquered. The Byzantines had neither the strength nor the time to oppose them. Among these little states were the beyliks of Menteşe, Aydın, Karası and Germiyan.¹⁸ Of these, Menteşe and Aydın successfully fought

14 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 155–68; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 114–20; Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 395–402.

15 About this major revolt which has a very important place from various points of view in Turkish history, see M. F. Köprülü, 'Anadolu'da İslâmiyet: Türk İstilasından Sonra Anadolu Tarih-i Dinisine Bir Nazar ve Bu Tarihin Menba'ları', *Dariülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 3–4 (1338/1922), 303–11; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 136–7, 221–2, 258–9; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 95–7, 181–2, 334–5; Claude Cahen, 'Bâbâ'î', *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2006) [henceforth *El2*], 1, pp. 843–4; A. Y. Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIIIe siècle* (Ankara, 1989), and the relevant bibliography in this book.

16 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 269–79; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 227–50; Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 427–57.

17 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum* (Histoire des Tartares), ed. Jean Richard (Paris, 1965).

18 For the only monograph which deals with these beyliks as a whole see İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri* (Ankara, 1988; repr. 1998). See also Claude Cahen, 'Les principautés turcomanes au début du IIIe siècle d'après Pachimère et Grégoras', *Tarih Dergisi* (Mélanges İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı) 39 (1979), 111–16. As an example of

with the Byzantines and the Venetians in the Aegean.¹⁹ Another beylik was established on the south-western borders of Byzantium: the Ottoman beylik which was to be transformed into the empire of Süleyman the Magnificent in the sixteenth century.

From the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Ottoman beylik, thanks both to its convenient geo-strategic position on the Byzantine frontier and to the successful policies of its first leaders Osman (?–c.1324), Orhan (c.1324–62) and Murad I (1362–89), advanced rapidly along the road to becoming an empire. Launching raids motivated both by spiritual and material aims, by the *gazi* ideology and booty, this beylik benefited from the political and economic weakness of Byzantium and of that in the Balkan peninsula, and expanded its territory both in Anatolia and in the Balkans. As a result, its administration and socio-economic structure were strengthened and by the middle of the fifteenth century a powerful empire was in the making.²⁰ At this point an energetic and young sultan, Mehmed II (1444–6, 1451–81), became the leader of the empire. Taking Constantinople in May 1453 and making it his capital, Mehmed II removed the one-time great Eastern Roman Empire to which he was at the same time heir and caused shock waves both in the Islamic world and in the west.

A complex and varied ethnic structure: the local elements (Greeks, Armenians, Suriyanis, Kurds), the Turks and the Tatars (Mongols)

We do not have statistics or definitive documentary historical data for the ethnic structure of Anatolia either before or after the arrival of the Turks.²¹ It has always been asserted that the population had declined as a result of the Muslim Arab raids. This is true, and was a natural consequence of the deaths caused by raiding, or of flight to the west. But this decline did not

one of the early monographs of a single beylik published over the years by both Turkish and western historians see P. Wittek, *Das Fröstentum Montesche: Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-14. Jahrhunderts* (Istanbul, 1934).

19 See especially E. A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Montesche and Aydin (1300–1415)* (Venice, 1983). The *Dasitan-i Gazi Umur Paşa*, written for Aydınoğlu Umur Bey, is a verse epic recounting his *gazas* and is an important historical document for describing the traditions of *gaza* and *cihad* in the beyliks; see Enveri, *Le Destan d'Umür Pacha*, ed. and tr. I. Mélikoff-Sayar (Paris, 1954).

20 For the Ottoman Empire in the first period of the classical age see H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age 1300–1600* (London, 1973).

21 For a general discussion of this topic see Claude Cahen, 'Le problème ethnique en Anatolie', *Cahier d'Histoire Mondiale* 2, 1 (1954–5), 347–62; Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 143–93. Vryonis here examines in detail the ethnic structure and transformation, region by region.

persist for long. It is certain that when the Turks came, a similar process must naturally have occurred, even if not to the same extent. At the time of the Turks' arrival the people of the region, called Rum in the Muslim sources, were composed of the original local population which had intermixed with the Greek population of the towns of western Anatolia and had become Christian. This population without doubt constituted the most significant element. An important percentage of the population was made up of villagers who had settled in the countryside and were engaged in agriculture. They must certainly have spoken and written a form of what is today modern Greek. Called *rumca* in Turkish, it carried traces of the remnants of the old Anatolian languages. In eastern Anatolia, a large part of the population consisted of Gregorian Armenians and Monophysite Jacobites. Further south, in the region of Mardin, were the Suriyanis, Syriac-speaking Christians.

A further dimension of the ethnic mix of medieval Turkey was the Kurdish population in Anatolia. Kurds are known to have lived in the region which was known as Kurdistan, a geographical term in early Islamic sources for an area stretching across parts of Iran, Iraq and Anatolia. The vast majority of them had converted to Islam long before, at the time of the Arab conquest, and a section of them were Yazidi.²² For this reason it can be suggested that a few of the Turkish tribes who settled in eastern and south-eastern Anatolia intermixed with the different Kurdish tribes there and, over time, became absorbed into the Kurdish majority and became Kurdish. While in areas of Kurdish majority, Turks began to speak Kurdish, so, too, in regions where the majority was Turkish, Kurds would have begun to speak Turkish and to have become Turks. That this happened is clearly indicated by a similar process taking place in various areas today, aided by practices such as intermarriage and urbanisation. The vast majority of the Kurds in these regions carried on a tribal existence and were engaged in animal husbandry. Some lived in the mountains and survived by plundering.²³

Turning to the Turks, the movement to and settlement in Anatolia of the Oğuz, also called Turkoman, who were the ancestors of the Turks of

22 Much has been published to date about the faith of the Yazidis. See, for example, Mehmed Şerefeddin, 'Yazidiler', *Dârülfünun İlahiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 1, 3 (1926), 1–35; R. Lescot, *Enquête sur les Yazidis de Syrie et du Djebel Sindjar* (Beirut, 1938); S. S. Ahmed, *The Yazidis: Their Life and Beliefs*, ed. Henri Field (Miami, 1975); M. Aydın, 'Yazidiler ve İnanç Esasları', *Belleten* 52 (1988), 923–53; M. van Bruinessen, 'Religion in Kurdistan', *Kurdish Times* 4 (1991), 1–27; J. Guest, *Survival among the Kurds: a History of the Yazidis* (London, 1993).

23 For this subject see, for example, Th. Bois, 'Kurds et Kurdistan (période islamique)', *El2*, v, pp. 452–9.

modern Turkey and had only recently become Muslim, began after the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt). Such settlement was not initially undertaken with the aim of settling permanently. After a time, however, the region became their new 'homeland'. It is important to remember that the majority of these Turks were from the Muslim Oğuz.²⁴ This population, driven from Iran by the Great Seljuk rulers, had no difficulty in finding suitable lands to settle on in this new homeland. The inner and eastern parts of Anatolia in particular provided both pastures where they passed the winter season with their flocks of sheep, and cool summer pastures.

The Byzantines did not react greatly to the Turkish entry into Anatolia which, beginning in the east, moved slowly westward, both because they were already familiar with the Guz (Oğuz) Turks who served in the Byzantine armies as mercenary soldiers alongside the Christian Kuman (Kıpçak) from the Balkans, and because they benefited from their help in the political struggles which broke out frequently among them. Moreover, non-Orthodox elements of the population of the region, who disliked and resented the Byzantine administration, were well disposed towards these foreign warriors who occupied the land and were not concerned with their religion. Indeed, they even encouraged them to settle there. There is no doubt that these two factors must have played an important role in easing and speeding up the Turkish conquest of Anatolia.²⁵

Western and Turkish historians disagree over various questions concerning the ethnic and demographic change which occurred with the settlement of the Turks in Anatolia. The most important of these is the demographic number of these new Anatolians. The second is the question of whether these Turks were entirely or only in part nomads.²⁶ Both western and Turkish historians have investigated the arrival and settlement of the Turkomans in Anatolia in two phases: before and after the Mongol invasion.²⁷ In the first phase, which begins with the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt), the Turkomans flowed en

24 The best work to date on the Oğuz, that is the Turkomans, is still the book by F. Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları* (Istanbul, 1972; repr. 1981). For the history of the Oğuz before they came to Anatolia see S. Grigorevic Agacanov, *Oğuzlar*, tr. from Russian by N. Ekber and A. Annaberdiyev (Istanbul, 2002).

25 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 204; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, p. 164.

26 There is a clear divide on these two matters between the Turkish historians and the older generation western historians. If examined carefully it is possible to understand that various preconceptions against the Turks in western public opinion played an important role in these views and in the Turkish reaction to them.

27 See, for example, M. H. Yinanç, *Türkiye Tarihi, Selçuklular Devri: Anadolu'nun Fethi* (Istanbul, 1944), pp. 166–9; Cahen, 'La première pénétration', pp. 68–9; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 143–54; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 101–9; Togan, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*, pp. 191–200; Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 1–44, 213–16.

masse into Anatolia and began to settle. Not all of those who came were nomads, for among them were Muslim Turks who had become urbanised while in Central Asia. When these people arrived they settled in the towns in Anatolia and continued to pursue their professions there. Even in this early period the Turkish population quickly began to reach a majority in relation to the local population in Anatolia. In the second phase, which began with the Mongol invasions, a mass of nomads arrived from the regions of Transoxania, Khorasm, Azerbaijan and Erran. Many urbanised Turks arrived, too, fleeing together with the nomadic population before the Mongols and taking refuge in Anatolia.²⁸ This period coincides with the reigns of İzzeddin Keykavus I and Alaeddin Keykubad I.

It has been suggested that the Turks came to Anatolia at a date much earlier than the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt).²⁹ Some western historians, however, such as Claude Cahen, have adopted a more cautious approach. They accept that in the first phase the Turks in Anatolia, while not yet reaching a figure greater than that of the local population, did attain fairly large numbers, but agree that the Turkish demographic superiority over the local population occurred and increased in particular after the Mongol invasion, that is, beginning in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.³⁰

The fact that western sources began to refer to Anatolia as ‘Turchia’ after the third crusade of 1189 led by Frederick Barbarossa³¹ indicates that Anatolia had by now become a Turkish region and that a process of ‘Turkification’ and, of course, parallel with this, one of ‘Islamisation’, had begun there. There is no doubt that this was a process begun by the Turkoman, whose numbers gradually increased, particularly in the rural areas, although the towns also had a share in this process. We are not in a position to give precise figures today for the numbers of the Turkish population in Anatolia in the invasion and

28 See Togan, *Umumî Türk Tarihine Giriş*, p. 196; F. Sümer, ‘Anadolu’ya Yalnız Göçebe Türkler mi Geldi?’, *Belleten* 24 (1960), 567–95.

29 See, for example, R. N. Frye and A. Sayılı, ‘Selçuklular’dan evvel Orta Şark’ta Türkler’, *Belleten* 10 (1946), 97–131. Even today, some of the younger generation of Turkish historians have written that in the period before Christ Turks settled in Anatolia and that these were proto-Turks (see, for example, V. Sevin, ‘Mystery Stelae: Are Stone Images Found in Southeastern Turkey Evidence of Early Nomads and a Lost Kingdom?’, *Archeology* (July/August 2000), 47–51; V. Sevin and A. Özfirat, ‘Hakkâri Stelleri: Doğu Anadolu’da Savaşçı Çobanlar’, *Belleten* 243 (2001), 501–18). Even if it is said that there are new archaeological finds related to this subject, no concrete proof has yet been presented.

30 See Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 103; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, p. 145. For more information on the Turkoman settlement see Cahen, ‘La première pénétration turque’, pp. 5–67; Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler)*; F. Sümer, *Çepniler: Anadolu’daki Türk Yerleşmesinde Önemli Rol Oynayan Bir Oğuz Boyu* (İstanbul, 1992).

31 See above note 3.

settlement period or for the local population, and there is no great likelihood that we will be able to in the future. If we possessed the *tahrir defterleri* (survey registers) which no doubt existed in the Seljuk period, as was noted above, we would be in a position to provide such figures. However, although we do not have definitive data for the non-Muslim population being smaller than the Turkish population, particularly before the Mongol invasion, it is certain that after this invasion the Turkish population slowly rose, overtaking that of the non-Muslims, to attain demographic superiority.³²

There is a further question related to this subject: whether the Turks who came and settled in Anatolia in both these periods were, or were not, Muslims. Various traces in the sources show that while the great majority of Turks had either been Muslims for some time or were recent converts, there were also Uyghurs and Kıpçaks, even if in small numbers, who had not abandoned Buddhism or Manichaeism, as well as Christian Turks who had converted to Nestorianism while still in Central Asia. There were still Nestorian Turks in the Ottoman period. Thus even in the sixteenth century one comes across groups (*Taife-i* or *Cemaat-i Gebran*) registered in *tahrir defters* as Christian populations despite having Turkish names. Western and Turkish historians have put forward various theories about these names. It seems highly probable that they were Turks who had joined the Nestorian sect and become Christian while still in Central Asia or who had perhaps become Orthodox after crossing into Anatolia. With the exception of these non-Muslims groups, however, the vast majority of the Turks in Anatolia were Muslim. The local population, on the other hand, was Christian, the great majority being Orthodox while some belonged to other Christian sects.

Gradually over time it is clear that an ethnic mix developed in both urban and rural areas of Anatolia as the two populations, the Muslims Turks and the Christian locals, began to live together. Even without definitive evidence on the subject, it is still not difficult to argue for the existence of mixed families, however limited in number, which came about particularly with the practice of taking girls from the Christian population.³³ Echoes of this are found in the many examples of such marriages in the epic romances such as the *Battalname* and the *Danişmendname*. It is clear that this ethnic mix must have had a decisive role in the conversion to Islam.

32 For a general account of the settling of the Turks in Anatolia from the eleventh to the thirteen centuries, see Y. Koç, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Türkiye'de Yerleşme ve Nüfus', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Yaşar Ocak (Ankara, 2006), pp. 241–8.

33 On this subject see Togan, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*, pp. 209–10.

Another perhaps more important ethnic mix in the Turkey of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century was related to the Mongols, who were referred to as Tatars in Latin sources of the period. As well as occupying almost all the regions suitable for nomadism in Central Asia, Mongol tribes in the post-1256 period, the end of the occupation of Anatolia, also settled in the winter pastures and the wide grasslands of the region. Known as 'Özler bölgesi' because of the streams which ran into the Kızılırmak river, this region of well-watered valleys was ideal for nomads who could spend their winters there and could graze their herds on the extensive pasture land there in the summer. Like the Turks, the Mongols were divided into two major branches, or wings (*kol*): the Bara'unkar (the right wing) and the Ca'unkar (the left wing). The nomadic Mongol tribes who belonged to the Ca'unkar settled between Kayseri, Sivas and Çorum, in a region which today includes the *vilayet* (district) of Yozgat.³⁴ Those from the Bara'unkar settled on the lands stretching as far as Eskişehir. Information on the customs and traditions of the Mongols, on their beliefs and their daily life in this period, is given by the Dominican priest Simon de Saint-Quentin whose work, *Historia Tartarorum*, covers the years between 1245 and 1248.³⁵

The tribes belonging to the Ca'unkar and the Bara'unkar established villages in the places where they settled and gave them names, some of which still survive today, for example, Tayfur, Topçu, Gökçekışla, Ağcaköy and Çaloğlu in the district of Yozgat. In the thirteenth century, after they had become Muslim, all these Mongol tribes which were known by the name Kara Tatars (Black Tatars) continued to live in the same areas until Timur's entry into Anatolia in 1402. Although Timur took some of them off with him to Iran, the majority remained in Anatolia and intermixed with the Turkoman.

Society

Observations and problems

While a large number of the Turkish Muslim population which came to Anatolia was nomadic, as we have said before, some gradually settled on the steppe lands and in empty Byzantine villages, which had either never been settled or had been deserted, or in villages which were inhabited by the local populations. These villages, the majority of which still exist today, are known

34 F. Sümer, 'Bozok Tarihine Dair Araştırmalar', *Cumhuriyet'in 50. Yıldönümü Anma Kitabı* (Ankara, 1974), pp. 309–81; Sümer, 'Anadolu'da Moğollar', *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1969), 1–147.

35 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum*.

by their old names, even if the pronunciation has changed somewhat. Other villages were founded by the new incomers. We know these, too, from their names.³⁶ Unfortunately there is little information relating either to the villages occupied by the incomers or for the villages in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. For this reason it is not possible to say anything about the socio-economic structure of the villages or about the villagers of this period, or about population figures or types of production. In contrast, however, we are better informed about the population figures and the economic situation of these villages in the Ottoman period. Thanks to the *tahrir* registers, we know the names of those who paid tax and the amounts involved. The considerable body of research on the *sancaks* (Ottoman provinces) conducted over the past twenty to twenty-five years has produced a great deal of data.³⁷ By analogy with this material, we can speculate about the social and economic structure of these villages in the earlier period, from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries. However, any assessment must remain speculative and cannot be regarded as in any way definitive.

This is in stark contrast to the wealth of information to be found on the great medieval Islamic cities of Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Basra, Beyhak, Tabriz, Merv, Balkh, Bukhara and Samarkand, for example, about which the many chronicles and geographical works provide much data. There were even accounts specific to certain cities written by Muslims. Unfortunately such sources are scarce, however, for the towns of Anatolia in the eleventh to fifteenth centuries. There are only a limited number of short entries to be found in the chronicles of this period and in one or two travel accounts. Furthermore, these towns have today completely lost any vestiges of their medieval structure. For this reason we are not in a position to be able to guess at what these towns were like by examining their modern-day manifestations.

³⁶ For these see in particular Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Dahiliye Vekâleti, *Son Teşkilât-ı Mülkiyede Köylerimizin Adları* (Istanbul, 1928); C. Türkay, *Başbakanlık Arşivi Belgelerine Göre Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Oymak, Aşiret ve Cemaatler* (Istanbul, 2001); O. Sakin, *16. Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Türkmenler ve Yörükler* (Istanbul, 2006). The old village names, which had existed for a very long time, have been changed either by various governments, or by the local administration, or as a result of the application to rename their villages by the villagers who did not have any historical understanding about the past. Such names have thus gone through a meaningless historical destruction.

³⁷ Examples of such research include N. Göyünç, *XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı* (Ankara, 1991); F. Emecen, *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazası* (Ankara, 1989); M. A. Ünal, *XVI. Yüzyılda Harput Sancağı* (Ankara, 1989); İ. Miroğlu, *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)* (Ankara, 1990); M. Öz, *XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Canik Sancağı* (Ankara, 1999); M. İlhan, *Amid (Diyarbakır), 1518 Detailed Register* (Ankara, 2000); H. Doğru, *XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Eskişehir ve Sultanönü Sancağı* (Istanbul, 1992).

We are, however, lucky in one respect for we have for the fourteenth century, the period known as the beylik period, the *Rihle*, the travel book of the Moroccan traveller Ibn Battuta.³⁸ For the Ottoman period the sources, as for the villages, are more extensive and we have *tahrir*, *muhasebes* (accounts) and *evkaf defters* (*vakıf* registers) as well as *şer'iyye sicilleri* (court registers). Despite this, however, we do not have material for the Anatolian Muslim cities of the Ottoman period in any way comparable to such records as those of local administration or from the church and monastery archives which shed light on the socio-economic, religious and cultural position of the towns and cities in Europe of the medieval and early modern period. Apart from this scarcity, we are also faced with a further problem: the quality of the data provided by the sources we do have. The information in the Seljuk and beylik and Ottoman sources for the religious establishments and social classes and groups, both Muslim and non-Muslim, is extremely meagre, for the majority of our sources are official state registers produced for strictly pragmatic administrative needs.

Any conceptualisation of the religious, social and cultural structure of the Anatolian cities of the Turkish period depends to a great extent on an understanding of the historical roots of the subject. It is important to remember that even if there were some general similarities between the European and the Anatolian cities of the Middle Ages and the early modern period, there were significant differences both from a social and a physical point of view. Such differences can be seen clearly, for example, in the work of Henri Pirenne on the medieval cities of Europe.³⁹

The semi-settled/semi-nomadic populations

The physical, demographic and social dimension of Turkish settlement which to an important extent changed the face of Anatolia from the ethnic and religious point of view, was on the one hand connected to towns and villages because of this newly settled Turkish population, but, on the other, was equally connected to the semi-settled, semi-nomadic sections in that it speeded up the transition to a settled way of life. When considering these Turks, it is important to stress the term 'nomad'. There is no doubt that, as has been noted above,

38 Ibn Battuta, *Muhadhdhab Rihlat Ibn Batoutah: Tuhfat al-Nuzzar fi Ghara'ib al-Amsar wa 'Adja'ib al-Asfar*, ed. A. al-Avamiri and M. A. al-Mawla, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1933); Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta, AD 1325–1354*, tr. H. A. R. Gibb, 4 vols. (London, 1962). Ibn Battuta gives valuable information on various Anatolian towns.

39 For a comparison of the structure of medieval towns see, for example, H. Pirenne, *Les villes du moyen âges* (Brussels, 1927).

a large majority of the Turks were nomadic Oğuz tribes who were known as Turkoman.⁴⁰ These Turks settled in valleys with streams in the inner and central regions of Anatolia which very much resembled the steppes of Central Asia. The majority of these tribes, like the Turkish tribes in Central Asia whose political leaders were at the same time their shamans, were guided by individuals who were both religious (*baba*, *ata*, *dede* or *abdal*) and political leaders and who for this reason had a religious-mystic character. Research in Ottoman *tahrir* registers and on toponymy has shown that many of the villages in Turkey were named after such leaders, having the word *baba*, *ata*, *dede* or *abdal* at the beginning or end of their names, as they still do even today.⁴¹ This shows that the Turkish tribes remembered the names of those who had guided them and that when they adopted a settled way of life they gave the names of these leaders to the villages they established. It was sometimes these individuals who, thanks to religious charisma, usually took the lead in revolting or struggling with the central administration over such issues as taxation, or who headed the settling of mass populations migrating over great distances. The two best-known examples are the Babai revolt under Baba İlyas-ı Horasani in 1240,⁴² and the migration to and settlement in the Dobrudja led by Sarı Saltık which took place shortly afterwards.⁴³

Such revolts demonstrate that the Turkoman tribes were a source of political troubles for both the Seljuk and the Ottoman administration. For this reason, the central administration in both periods followed a policy of dividing the Turkoman tribes and settling them far from each other in areas which had no connection between them in order to forestall the spreading and strengthening of any trouble which they could not control. This policy of enforced migration (*sürgün*) was used for Kurdish tribes and, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the nineteenth century, Kurdish tribes from eastern and

40 See M. F. Köprülü, *Les origines de l'empire ottoman* (Paris, 1935), pp. 56–60. Some research on Ottoman archival sources on the Turkoman and the Yörüks in the Ottoman period has recently been published. Apart from the works of F. Sümer referred to above, see also for medieval Turkey, M. S. Polat, *Selçuklu Göçerlerinin Dünyası: Karacuk'tan Aziz George Koluna* (Istanbul, 2004). For a collection of articles on this period see *Anadolu'da ve Rumeli'de Yörükler ve Türkmenler (Sempozyum Bildirileri, Tarsus 13–14 Mayıs)*, Yörük Türkmen Vakfı (Ankara, 2000); T. Gündüz, 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Türkmenler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurluğu I*, ed. Ocak, in particular pp. 269–73.

41 See note 36 above.

42 For this, and for a large bibliography, see Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul*. An expanded and revised edition of this book was published in 2000, *Babailer İsyanı: Aleviliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı Yahut Anadolu'da İslâm-Türk Heterodoksisinin Teşekkülü* (Istanbul, 2000).

43 For the latest work on this subject, which contains an extensive bibliography, see A. Y. Ocak, *Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslâm'ın Balkanlardaki Destanı Öncüsü* (Ankara, 2002).

south-eastern Anatolia were settled in regions of central Anatolia such as the plains of Konya, Haymana and Kırşehir.

In spring the Turkoman and the Kurds migrated to the summer pastures to graze their herds and lived until winter in tents which they produced. During the moving between summer and winter pastures clashes and fights often broke out with the settled population because of the damage caused by the nomads' camels or flocks of sheep to the orchards, gardens and fields they passed through, or even because of the pillaging of villages and towns. Despite these seasonal movements, the Turkoman and Kurds were not entirely nomadic, living solely in tents and passing their lives in moving with their herds of sheep, goats, oxen and camel between the winter and summer pastures. In winter, they settled in well-watered valleys protected from the cold and snow in villages which they themselves had established or which already existed. In the spring, a section of the population remained in the village engaged in animal husbandry and field agriculture. They then sold their produce in established markets and with the proceeds bought the manufactured goods they needed: weapons, pots and pans, clothes, harness sets and some woven products for clothes. The most famous examples of these markets were Ziyaret Pazarı and Yabanlu Pazarı.⁴⁴ The majority of these villages had no mosque, there being only an adobe or basic stone *mescid* built in a very simple style. For this reason none of these *mescids* survives today. The *medreses* found in the large towns did not exist in these villages either.

Apart from the Turkomans and Kurds, the rural population was also made up of the nomadic Mongol tribes who invaded Anatolia in 1246. These tribes were shamanist. After a certain time they began slowly to accept Islam as a result of the missionary activity of the Turkoman *babas*.⁴⁵ Like the Turkoman, the Mongols settled in the steppes of Anatolia and set up their own villages or settled in the Turkoman villages where they intermixed with the Turkoman population. Thus these Mongol tribes, called Tatars, moved from a nomadic existence to a semi-settled life and the Mongol population began partly to occupy itself with agriculture. Today many villages in the inner regions of Turkey from Sivas to Eskişehir were set up by the Mongols and still have their names from that period.⁴⁶

44 The only monograph to date on Yabanlu Pazarı is F. Sümer, *Yabanlu Pazarı: Selçuklular Devrinde Milletlerarası Büyük Bir Fuar* (İstanbul, 1985).

45 See A. Y. Ocak, 'Bazı Menâkıbnâmelere Göre XIII.–XV. Yüzyıllardaki İhtidâlarda Heterodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları (Journal of the Ottoman Studies)* 2 (1981), 31–42, which discusses the sources on this subject.

46 See A. Y. Ocak, 'Emirci Sultan ve Zâviyesi: XIII. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)'da bir Babaî Şeyhi, *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 9 (1978), 130–208.

Villages and villagers

When the Turkoman began to settle in Anatolia, they came into contact in the rural areas with the Byzantine villagers and with their way of life and culture. Owing to the climatic conditions of the Anatolian steppe and the difficulties of irrigation round the villages, the agricultural activity of the Byzantine villagers on small areas of low productivity was limited. They produced a restricted variety of crops such as wheat, barley, oats, vetch and millet. Apart from this, they grew small quantities of fruit and vegetables in gardens on the banks of streams. Animal husbandry was another important aspect of this agricultural activity. Each peasant family had the amount of land which it could plough with a pair of oxen. Part of this land was left fallow.

The location of the villages could change over time according to different factors such as water resources, climatic changes, political conditions, drought and plagues. As everywhere else, the villages paid taxes in cash or kind on their production. The taxes, the amount of which was set by the state, were collected by state-employed tax-collectors who were under the *prefectura* / the governors (*valis*).

After the tenth century, the Byzantine villagers became unable to pay the taxes which gradually increased. In time the bureaucrats in the central administration began to take over village lands and villagers were reduced to dependency on these bureaucrats. Thus the villagers descended into the position of being 'semi-serfs' working on their own land as share croppers or to avoid starvation. The conditions in which the Byzantine villager existed in the period of the Turkish conquest in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were thus harsh. Further, in the period of the first Turkish conquests, the Byzantine village populations, especially in eastern and central Anatolia, deserted their homes and lands and, with the Byzantine administration being driven westwards, were left exposed to great difficulties.

This, then, was the situation of the rural areas of the Byzantine Empire at the time when the Turks began to settle in Anatolia. A large part of the newly arriving semi-settled, semi-nomadic Turkoman population adapted quickly to the rural structure which they found, settling either in Byzantine villages which already existed or in villages which they set up themselves. They learnt to farm, they began to raise livestock: in short, they became a settled village population. We must note here the importance of not forgetting the unknown number of Turkish villagers who came together with the Turkoman from Central Asia.

The Byzantine villagers, who speedily abandoned their homes during the period of the first conquests and fled to the regions in the west or were moved

there by the Byzantine administration, began to observe and to be reassured by the policy followed by the Anatolian Seljuk state towards the local population. In an intelligent move motivated by the desire to revitalise agriculture, some of the sultans returned their former lands without obligations to the Byzantine villagers taking refuge in western Anatolia, helped them with provisions, animal harnesses and seed in order to ensure production, and, even more significantly, exempted them from taxation for a period of fifteen years.⁴⁷ This policy was not slow in producing results and the Byzantine villagers began to return again to what was now Seljuk land.⁴⁸

The village population in Seljuk Anatolia was thus made up of the mass of these semi-settled, semi-nomadic Turkoman who came to Anatolia and became villagers, Turkish villagers who migrated from Central Asia, and the Byzantine villagers. Some, even in the Byzantine period, established themselves on empty land suitable for settlement and prospered. Evidence for this comes from the Ottoman *tahrir* registers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We can see from these *tahrir* registers that an important section of the tents which were permanently used as winter settlements were transformed over time into villages. It is clear that these types of winter settlements which were called 'yurt' and became villages were places suitable for both animal husbandry and agriculture, and that they were not chosen by chance.⁴⁹

We can presume that the agricultural life of the Turkish villages in Anatolia in the twelfth to the fifteenth century and the social status dependent on it was, perhaps with some changes, the same in the beylik and Ottoman periods.⁵⁰

47 O. Turan, 'Hristiyanları Tehcir ve İskân Siyaseti', in *Türk Cihan Hâkimiyeti Mefkûresi Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1969), pp. 156–7.

48 On the subject of the socio-economic structure of the Byzantine villages and villagers before the Turkish settlements, see, for example, L. Brehier, 'La population rurale au IX^e siècle d'après l'hagiographie byzantine', *Byzantion* 1 (1924), 177–90; G. Roillard, *La vie rurale dans l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1953); M. Kaplan, 'Les villageois aux premiers siècles byzantins (VI^e–X^e): une société homogène?', *Byzantino-Slavica* 43 (1982), 202–17; M. Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VI^e au XI^e siècle: propriété et exploitation du sol* (Paris, 1992).

49 There is still no monograph on the villages and villagers of medieval Anatolia. The sources are extremely poor on this subject. From this point of view the history of Byzantine villages in the same period is more fortunate. For some information on Anatolian village life and villages in the thirteenth to the fifteenth century see M. Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin İktisadî ve İçtimai Tarihi*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1971–4), 1, pp. 24–8; Y. Koç, 'Selçuklular Döneminde Anadolu'da Köyler ve Köylüler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurluğu* 1, ed. Ocak, pp. 293–8.

50 It can be seen that part of the Ottoman rural organisation, called the *çift-hane* system by Halil İnalcık (H. İnalcık, 'The Çift-hane System: the Organization of Ottoman Rural Society', in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, ed. H. İnalcık and D. Quataert (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 143–54), was nothing other than a continuation of the system in the rural areas in the Byzantine period.

For this reason, when we compare it with the status of the villagers in the Ottoman period, we can easily say that, apart perhaps from a lessening of tax and the use of various methods to encourage production, the position in the Seljuk and beylik periods was not very different from that in the Byzantine period.

We can also say that agricultural practices which were used throughout the twelfth to fifteenth centuries continued without the slightest change from those employed in the Byzantine Empire: ploughs, oxen or buffalo were used for agriculture, as they were for the entire Ottoman period, and the same types of crops, such as wheat, barley, oats, vetch and rye, were sown and reaped using the same methods. It has been argued that rice production was brought into Anatolia by the Turks and that there is no record whatsoever of rice production in the Byzantine period. We know that viniculture was undertaken in various suitable locations, for example on the edges of villages and towns, and that it was fairly widespread.

It is not difficult to imagine, therefore, that as a result of all these developments the number of villages in Anatolia rose in comparison with the Byzantine period and that this was reflected in agricultural production. It is necessary to note here that these villages were defined as *miri* land within the Seljuk landholding system, that is, the state was the owner of the land upon which these villages were established and where the villages engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry, and the state, as part of the *miri* system, gave the right of possession of the villages and the right of collecting tax on the produce of the villages to soldiers and administrators as *ikta* in return for service. We must further recall that a percentage of these villages was turned into *vakıf* either by members of the Ottoman royal house or by high bureaucrats over the twelfth to the seventeenth century, that is throughout the Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman periods.

Towns and townspeople

Old towns with new owners and newly founded towns

It is an established historical fact that from the end of the eleventh century onwards almost all the Anatolian towns which over time had become Roman in the classical period and then Byzantine, with the exception of those in the west, gradually became Turkish in a process which began in the east and spread westwards. It is important not to forget that these towns were very different both structurally and socially in the Christian period from what they

had been in classical times. The majority of these towns, shrinking over time for various reasons, had been transformed for ease of defence into fortified towns (*kastron*).

When the Turks arrived, Byzantine towns were generally of this type. A significant number of Turks settled in the Byzantine towns in Anatolia. Gradually the organisation of these towns changed, partly as a result of this new settlement, and, with the consequent increase in population, extended beyond their walls. It is reasonable to assume, too, that with this new order, new settled areas must also have been created within the walls. For example, we know that the application of the principle of Muslims and non-Muslims living in separate *mahalles* (neighbourhoods) began. These *mahalles* were separated from each other by a wall. In certain towns, a second outer wall was put round the original outside wall in order to protect the settled area which had expanded beyond the castle.

Famous towns of the former Roman-Byzantine period such as Konya (Iconium), which was the capital of the Seljuks and, later, of Karaman, Amasya (Amaseia), Sinop, Sivas (Sebasteia), Kayseri (Caesarea in Capadocia), Kırşehir (Mocissus), Eskişehir (Dorylaion), Ankara (Ancyranum), and even Antalya (Attaleia) can be given as examples of Roman-Byzantine towns which were settled by the Turks. Here buildings such as mosques, *medreses*, *tekkes* (dervish lodges), markets and baths were constructed in order to revive the prosperity of these towns.

Claude Cahen rejects the thesis adopted by various western Byzantinists that Turkish settlement damaged these old towns, and that this was the reason for an economic, and therefore social, backwardness which completely paralysed all commercial life. According to Cahen, while it is true that initially these towns underwent a shock, they quickly recovered and became more prosperous than before thanks to vigorous trading activity.⁵¹ For example İzzeddin Keykavus I and Alaeddin Keykubad I took great care to encourage international trade, both by the conquest of Sinop, by İzzeddin Keykavus, and that of Antalya by Alaeddin Keykubad, and by the granting of concessions to Venetian and French merchants.⁵² There is no doubt that the Anatolian sultans regarded the strengthening of economic life as the way to secure their wealth in this new homeland. For this reason they built fortified places in which to stay called caravansarys (*kervansaray*s) at set distances on the trade routes to ensure the

⁵¹ Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 189–91; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 148–50.

⁵² Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 395–6.

security of these routes and to allow the caravans to travel safely. Some of these caravansarys are still standing today, even if most of them are now in ruins.⁵³

Apart from revitalising old Roman-Byzantine towns, the Turks also set up new towns such as Alaiye (modern Alanya), Kubadiye, Akşehir, Beyşehir and Seydişehir because of either their suitable locations, their strategic importance or their proximity to the trade routes. These new towns were built either near to or on the sites of former towns which had been abandoned in the Byzantine period. For example, Donuzlu (modern Denizli), built in the second quarter of the thirteenth century immediately to the south of the abandoned town of Laodikeia, near Hierapolis, was a new town of this type.

Towns which had been important either politically and commercially or culturally in the period of the Seljuks, the Ilkhans, the Saltukids and the Mengüceks, such as Erzurum, Erzincan, Ahlat, Van and Bitlis in eastern Anatolia, or Amid (Diyarbakır), Urfa, Mardin and Ayıntab in south-eastern Anatolia in the period of the Ayyubids and the Artukids, lost their position in the thirteenth century in the period of the Anatolian Seljuks to towns such as Sivas, Tokat, Kırşehir, Konya and Kayseri, and became towns of second-rate importance. From the last quarter of the thirteenth century when the Anatolian Seljuk state began to weaken and pass under Ilkhan domination and the beyliks rose in central, southern and western Anatolia, the towns of central Anatolia declined in importance and, in the second half of the fourteenth and in the fifteenth century those of western Anatolia became dominant. This development, which occurred in parallel with the changing political control moving from the east to the west, was, of course, inevitable.

These towns were administered by officials such as the *naib*, *vali*, *müşrif*, *nazır* or *muhtesib*, appointed from the centre by the sultan or the *bey*, and by a number of civilian individuals, such as the *emir-i iğdişan*, *hacegan*, *ehl-i fütüvvet* and *ehl-i hiref*, who worked with them as representatives of the people and whose functions and names changed according to circumstance and to the period.⁵⁴

One difference between these Anatolian towns and those in other Muslim countries was the presence there in the thirteenth to the fifteenth

53 K. Erdmann and H. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karvansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1961–76); O. Turan, 'Selçuklu Kervansarayları', *Belleten* 10, 39 (1946), 471–96.

54 For more information on the town life of medieval Turkey see Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin İktisadî ve İltimaî Tarihi*, 1, pp. 12–24. For more detailed research based on new material see T. Baykara, 'Türkiye Selçukluları'nda Şehir/Kent ve Şehirli/ Kentliler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 275–92. This article gives detailed information and an analysis of Seljuk urbanisation in the period under discussion.

century of partly Sufi co-operative organisations which were called *ahilik* and which originated in all probability in western Iran. It is known from Sufi texts called *fütüvvetname* found among the *ahis* that the *fütüvvet* organisation of the medieval Islamic world played a significant part in the emergence of this organisation. *Ahilik* was an association which united craftsmen in the Anatolian towns and had a semi-Sufi identity. For this reason only Muslim craftsmen were *ahis*.⁵⁵ We do not have much information about them until the Mongol period (the second half of the thirteenth century) when the famous Ahi Evren was alive. More information becomes available from the fourteenth century and we owe much of it to the famous Moroccan traveller Ibn Battuta.⁵⁶

It is well known that, like the members of the *fütüvvet* which became important in times of political and social strife in the large towns of the medieval Islamic world, the *ahis* in Anatolia, too, had a say in the administration of the towns at times in which the central administration was weak. It has thus long been accepted that they played an important part in the process of the establishment of the Ottoman state.⁵⁷

Townpeople

There was no great difference, therefore, between the towns of Anatolia and those classic Islamic cities of the Middle East or even Central Asia in terms of either their physical structure or their social and economic organisation. Their general characteristics rapidly emerged: just like Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Beyhak, Tabriz, Merv, Balkh, Bukhara and Samarkand, they became cosmopolitan centres with a bureaucracy and were composed of different ethnic, religious, social and professional groups. Here Christian, Jewish and Muslim populations lived together. But, despite this mixed nature, they were Muslim towns and an Islamic character predominated, the result of trade

55 It is known that the *ahilik* of the medieval Islamic world was tied to the *fütüvvet* institution. Such an institution is not met with outside western Iran. The area where this institution was widespread from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century was Anatolia. For more information on the *ahilik* see F. Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, 3 vols. (Ankara, 1966; repr. 1976), pp. 207–16; Köprülü, 'Anadolu'da İslâmiyet', pp. 386–7; Köprülü, *Les origines de l'empire ottoman*, pp. 128–9; F. Taeschner, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Achis in Anatolien', *Studia Islamica* 4 (1931), 1–47; G. G. Arnakis, 'Futuvva Tradition in the Ottoman Empire: Ahis, Bektashi Derviches and Craftsmen', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12 (1953), 232–56; Claude Cahen, 'Sur les traces des premiers Ahis', in *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü* (Istanbul, 1953), pp. 81–91; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 105–200, 337–41; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, pp. 154–60, 316–20. It is not necessary to mention here the many publications which have appeared over the past twenty years, the majority of which are apologies for *ahilik*, which exalt it and which are of no importance.

56 Ibn Battuta, *Tuhfat al-Nuzzar*, 1, pp. 223–63.

57 Köprülü, *Les origines de l'empire ottoman*, pp. 107–12. Later a section of Turkish historians greatly inflated the importance of this subject.

and commercial relations with the Arab world and, particularly, with Iran. Further, urban Turks, moving into Anatolia from Central Asia and settling there, brought to these towns the traditions of the cities in the regions of Transoxania and Khorasm, such as those mentioned above, where they had previously lived. This cultural tie with the cities of Central Asia continued almost throughout the entire Ottoman period.

The majority of the Muslim population in the towns of Anatolia was undoubtedly made up of Turks. Turkish migrations, which increased from the thirteenth century, strengthened this shift to a Turkish majority in the urban centres. Although some Turkoman still remained outside urban life, sources from the Ilkhan (Mongol) period talk of Turkoman who had begun to trade, settling, for example, in Sivas.⁵⁸

In large centres such as Konya, Sivas and Kayseri, there were also, naturally, *ulema*, merchants and bureaucrats of Arab and Persian origin. Ibn Battuta talks of having spoken with such *ulema* and bureaucrats in the towns of Anatolia where he travelled in the first half of the fourteenth century.⁵⁹ Apart from the ordinary people, those elements of urban life which remained unchanged through Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman times were the *ulema* and the bureaucrats; religious employees such as the *imams*, the *hatibs* and the *müezzins*; the *müftüs*, the *kadıs* and the *müderreses*, who had both a legal and a religious identity; the *seyyids* and the *şerifs* who were descended from the family of the Prophet, and, in particular, the *şeyhs* and the dervishes who were members of the Sufi *tarikats*, an extremely widespread institution in the period. The non-Muslims, either in large or small numbers according to the towns (Greeks, Armenians, and lesser numbers of Jews and European traders), formed a further unchanging population in some Anatolian towns such as İzmir, Konya, Bursa, Sivas and Kayseri in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. If we look at the information in Ibn Battuta, we find that in some towns in the fourteenth century Greeks, in other towns Armenians, outnumbered the Turks.⁶⁰ There were a large number of Jews in trade centres such as Konya, Antalya, Sinop and Sivas.⁶¹ The increasing importance of Bursa after the Ottoman conquest gained it a reputation as an international centre in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We know that side by side with a large Muslim population of Turkish origin, Muslims of Arab and Persian extraction, Greeks, Jews, and even Armenians lived in fairly large numbers there. They were settled in the different quarters called *mahalles*. The

58 See, for example, Z. M. Kazvini, *Athar al-Bilad wa Akhbar al-'Ibad* (Beirut, 1960), p. 537.

59 Ibn Battuta, *Tuhfat al-Nuzzar*, I, pp. 224–62, for various references.

60 Ibn Battuta, *Tuhfat al-Nuzzar*, I, p. 239.

61 T. Baykara, *Türkiye Selçukluları Devrinde Konya* (Ankara, 1985), p. 137.

mahalle, which is not found in medieval European cities, was always a basic element of classic Islamic towns, particularly in the Middle East.⁶²

The centres of social life: the *vakıf* associations

The best-known documents of the process of Turkification, and at the same time of Islamisation, of Anatolia are the foundation documents of the *vakıfs* which became of great importance in the towns at almost the same time as Turkish settlement and which continued to be so in the centuries that followed. As is known all the socio-religious associations in the Islamic world were based from the Ummayyad period onwards on an understanding and application of the *vakıf*. The theoretical basis for the *vakıf* institution, various examples of which can be found in the same regions before the arrival of Islam, rested on an Islamic principle which can be summarised as presenting a part of the capital of the rich for the help of the poor purely for the approval of God without looking to any reward in return. But it is not possible to say that throughout a long historical process this was the only motive to play a role, and it is certain that the long-term protection of the economic interests of those establishing a *vakıf* and of their families was also seen as an important factor.⁶³

The *vakıf* was a financial-administrative mechanism for such social assistance and financial activities as constructing and running buildings with social and religious functions such as *medreses*, hospitals (*şifahane*), mosques, or *mescids*, *zaviyes* (or, depending on the time, the place and the functions which they performed, *tekiyyes*, *hanekahs*, *dergahs* and *asitanes*), baths (*hamams*) and caravansarys (*kervansaray*s), collectively known as an *imaret* (or much later *küllîye*); for giving scholarships to students, treating the sick, giving financial help to *mühtedis* (converts to Islam), and healing injured animals. The Turkish Anatolian towns in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, and of course later, continued this traditional structure. There are many documents in the Ottoman archives showing how this system worked. The most important of these documents are the *vakfiyeler*, the title deeds of *vakıfs*, which were set up in the *sancaks* (provinces), the equivalent of the *il* system, the

62. This urban structure, based on the *mahalle* in the centre of which were found, and are still found in the towns of Turkey today, a mosque or a *mescid* and the remains of a *tekke* which continued to exist but with its function now changed, persisted throughout the entire Ottoman period to today.

63. See, for example, L. Milliot, *Introduction à l'étude du droit musulman* (Paris, 1953), pp. 547–50; F. Köprülü, 'Vakıf Müessesesinin Hukuki Mahiyeti ve Tarihi Tekamülü', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), 1–36; Claude Cahen, 'Reflexions sur le waqf ancien', *Studia Islamica* 14 (1961), pp. 37–9; B. Yediyıldız, 'Vakıf', *İA*, xiii, pp. 153–72; B. Yediyıldız, *Institution du waqf au XVIIIe siècle en Turquie: étude socio-historique* (Ankara, 1990); R. Peters, 'Wakf', *El2*, x, pp. 59–63.

administrative unit in Turkey today, and *evkaf defterleri* which include the *vakıf* registrations.⁶⁴

On account of its significant role in the social structure, a fairly systemised *vakıf* law was developed in Islamic law. This also recognised the legality of non-Muslim *vakıfs* in an Islamic country. Thus the *vakıfs* of churches and monasteries which existed on land that passed from the Byzantines to the Seljuks, to the beyliks and then to the Ottomans continued unaltered and their administration was left to these institutions.

Even if no comprehensive, detailed monograph has yet been published on the *vakıfs* of the period we are investigating, still some *vakıfs* belonging to the Anatolian Seljuk period have been published by scholars such as Zeki Oral, Muallim Cevdet, Ahmet Temir and, in particular, Osman Turan, and, in more recent times, by Refet Yinanç and İsmet Kayaoglu. But the majority of these are copies from the Ottoman period of the very few *vakıf* title deeds from the Anatolian Seljuk period which have survived to our day.⁶⁵

When these documents from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century are examined one sees that the *vakıfs* were divided into three categories as regards the sources of their income. The first was the type of *vakıf* which was created from the income sources of individual goods and property, and in *vakıf* law was defined as 'sahih vakıf', true *vakıf*. The second, as in Ottoman *vakıfs*, was that not based on individual property but created from units dependent on villages, land and other similar sources, and on various taxes, and these were called 'yarı sahih yarı irsadi vakıflar', 'half true half *irsadi vakıfs*'. The third category was the 'irsadi vakıflar' which were established on the basis of real estate rather than individual wealth, which was made up of villages, arable land, pasture lands or other similar land, which passed into the possession of an individual by means of a grant or by some other means, and which over time turned into *irsadi vakıfs* which were defined as 'gayr-i sahih vakıf', 'false *vakıfs*'.

64 The Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi which is found today in Ankara has a large, rich collection of documents made up of this type of register, particularly for the Ottoman period. For detailed, new research on this archival material see H. Yüksel, 'Anadolu Selçukluları'nda Vakıflar', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 309–28.

65 Of the *vakıf* deeds in private hands or in the various archives, the most important of which is the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi, hardly any are original. Moreover, those which are recorded in the registers of the above-mentioned archives are extremely badly made copies. Most of them are careless copies made by the *evkaf katipleri*, the *vakıf* scribes, of *vakıf* deeds in the hands of the trustees of *vakıfs*, after the establishment of the Evkaf Nezareti, the Ministry of *Vakıfs*, in 1826.

We do not have the statistical data for how many mosques, *mescids*, *medreses*, *zaviyes* and *türbes* (graves, tombs), *hamams* (baths), *bedestans* (markets), bridges, fountains and so on there were in these *vakıfs* in the Anatolian towns in the centuries we are discussing. Apart from the monumental buildings defined as *vakıf* which remain standing today, it is not always possible to prove that those which are not so defined and are in ruins or have been lost were *vakıf* buildings. However, thanks to archival sources we are more fortunate for the Ottoman period. As a result of the work conducted on archival documents on the *sancaks* of the classical Ottoman period, we have access to the registrations of the majority of these *vakıf* organisations, even for those which no longer exist today. In this context it is important to remember that a percentage of the organisations which passed into the Ottoman archival registers came from the Seljuk and beylik periods and operated in the Ottoman period: they thus originated in the earlier period, in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries.

We still do not know precisely the role and importance of these organisations in the spread and establishment of Islam in Anatolia, or, therefore, in the creation and development of Islamic culture: in short, we are to some extent ignorant about their socio-cultural history. For this reason, we are still unable to give a satisfactory, definite and detailed answer to questions regarding, for example, the contributions of *vakıf* organisations of this type to Muslim social life and culture in Anatolia in the Anatolian Seljuk, the beylik and even the Ottoman periods.

Mosques which formed part of *vakıfs* were clearly important in the locations in which they were found for they were open to all Muslims regardless of status or affiliation. As is well known, the mosque had been the most characteristic unit of the Muslim urban landscape since the beginning of Islam. It was both a holy place essential for collective worship and a type of *forum*, a social space where all subjects, including politics, were debated, to which news was brought by Muslims arriving from foreign countries, and where the conversation of the *ulema* was listened to and lessons attended.⁶⁶ It was also a place where those who had no home or family could from time to time stay for short periods. These characteristics equally applied to the Anatolian mosques in the Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman periods.

One of the most significant socio-religious institutions in the towns and cities in Anatolia in this period was certainly the Sufi foundations which were known by names such as *zaviye*, *tekiyye*, *dergah*, *asitane*, *hanekah*, and *buk*,

⁶⁶ On this subject see L. Pedersen, R. Hillenbrand and J. Burtonpage, 'Masdjid', *El2*, vi, pp. 644–703.

depending on their location, size and function. These buildings, which were in origin where Sufi members of various *tarikats* (Sufi orders) lived, were at the same time buildings where travellers of every faith and culture, both Muslim and non-Muslim, could stay without paying. This was one of the conditions for their existence which was written into a *vakıf* deed.

In the history of the Turkification and Islamisation of Anatolia, these institutions played at least as important a role as the mosques and *mescids*. While these institutions differed according to the nature of the *tarikats* to which they were tied, they shared the same general characteristics. In the rural *zaviyes*, the dervishes worked during the day on their fields or were occupied with animal husbandry and other such agricultural activities; in the evenings they organised *sema* religious ceremonies and *zikr* assemblies and conducted Sufi education of the disciples (*mürîd*).⁶⁷ Much research has been produced since the publication of the well-known article by Ö. Lütfi Barkan on their role in the Islamisation of towns and villages where there was a mixed population of Muslims and non-Muslims, and a great many documents on this subject have survived from the Ottoman period.

Culture and religion

In the context of the history of Islam in Anatolia, the religious life of Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries has not been much researched. Neither the very well known article by F. Babinger nor that of F. Köprülü (much better researched and based on much richer material which attacked theories put forward by Babinger) covered every aspect of the subject. These articles should perhaps be regarded more as representing an important beginning to the investigation of this topic. It is nevertheless interesting to note that despite the considerable amount of time which has passed since their publication, no more comprehensive or methodological research has been undertaken.⁶⁸ Here we shall try to give a general picture of the main problems to be found in trying to deal with this subject.

67 For the historical significance of these Sufi institutions and for a general assessment see A. Y. Ocak and S. Faruki, 'Zâviye', *İA*, xiii, pp. 468–76.

68 F. Babinger, 'Der Islâm in Kleinasien: neue Wege der Islâmforschung', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 76 (1922), 126–52; Köprülü, 'Anadolu'da Islâmiyet'. Here, however, one can note two more recent works on this subject, one relatively old and the other newer: O. Çetin, *Selçuklu Müesseseleri ve Anadolu'da Islâmiyet'in Yayılışı* (İstanbul, 1981); S. Kara, *Selçuklular'ın Dini Serüveni: Türkiye'nin Dini Yapısının Tarihsel Arka Plânı* (İstanbul, 2006).

As is well known, Anatolia, from before the Roman dominion and throughout it, was a region which had a very rich and varied panoply of pagan cults which had survived from ancient times and had roots stretching back over thousands of years. Affected by various outside influences, these cults had developed their own, particular forms. By the time the region was taken over by Byzantium, it had already been under the influence of Christianity for some considerable time. Despite this, the Orthodox faith, which became the official religion of the empire, was unable fully to penetrate the most remote corners of Anatolia over the first few hundred years of the empire's existence. Even in the sixth century when Byzantium was at its height, Christianity was not able completely to overthrow the pagan cults but was only able to mask them. As true pagan cults worshipping various gods from former times continued to exist, even Christianity itself cannot be said to have been more for many 'Christians' than a basic and crude Trinity of God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. These 'Christians' pursued their beliefs in their old gods and various saints who were either imagined or real people by adapting them to Christianity. It is known that the first Christian priests who carried out missionary activities in various parts of the empire were only successful in making a new religion there by providing a new interpretation of the old beliefs and by making this interpretation acceptable. This approach produced various types of popular Christianity created from an amalgam of Christianity and pagan cults which continued to exist and to be practised.⁶⁹

One of these was that of the dualist churches which came into existence as a result of the influence of the Manichaeists. Having been declared heretics in the Zoroastrian Sassanid Empire, they had fled from Iran and taken refuge in Anatolia where they had, in appearance, become Christian.⁷⁰ In its political struggle with Byzantium, Iran encouraged the propagation and spread of Zoroastrian propaganda in Anatolia. Followers of religions which appeared as a reaction to Zoroastrism, such as eastern Mazdaism and Manichaeism, were forced to flee from Iran into Anatolia where Christianity came forcibly into contact with them. Over time and under the influence of these Iranian religions, new Christian sects with a dualist character based on the concepts of goodness and evil of the gods, such as Marcionism ('Marika' in

69 Ostrogorsky, *Histoire de l'état byzantin*, pp. 76–7; J. Jarry, *Hérésies et factions dans l'empire byzantin* (Cairo, 1968), pp. 154–5.

70 From the many recent publications on this subject see, for example, M. Roquebert, *Histoire des Cathares: hérésie, croisade, inquisition du XIe au XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1999); Y. Perrin Stoyanov, *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy* (New Haven, 2000), and note 104 below.

Islamic heresyographic sources), and Paulicianism ('Bavlakiyye' and 'Baya-lika' in Islamic heresyographic sources) which was to play an important role in the emergence of Bogomilism and Tondrakism, emerged. These sects had a powerful influence on the Byzantine population (the Armenians and the Greeks), especially in the rural areas.⁷¹

This amalgamation of religious ideas resulted gradually in the formation among the various ethnic-religious groups such as the Greeks, Armenians and Suriyanis in Anatolia of independent 'heretical' churches outside the Orthodox fold. At the same time, the Orthodox faith itself also underwent changes. In particular, new separatist sects such as the Jacobites and Nestorians appeared as a result of the influence of various old Greek and Hellenistic schools of philosophical thought. These were labelled 'deviational', heretical, by the Orthodox church and by the Byzantine administration which claimed control of it.⁷² Although the Byzantine government, faced with these separatist religious currents, took forceful measures to strengthen Orthodoxy, and, forcing the various ethnic groups in Anatolia to accept the church, sought to use the church as a means to ensure the compliance of the population, this policy produced the opposite effect and Anatolia instead became the setting for various religious struggles.

Thus, when the Turks began to settle in Anatolia in the eleventh century they encountered a highly heterogeneous religious environment. The regions of inner and eastern Anatolia were divided into the small churches we have described, which had arisen as a reaction to Orthodoxy and which, for various political, social, economic and cultural reasons, were spread among the ethnic groups, apart from the Greeks. A point which must be stressed here in particular is that this religious division played an important role in the easing of the Turkish conquests in Anatolia and in their diffusion, and, therefore, favourably assisted their settlement in the region. Let us once more stress that the local population, exasperated by the state's attitude which opened the way to separation of religious views and crushed by high taxation, were not particularly willing to oppose the Turks.

71 See H.-Ch. Peuch, *Le Manichéisme* (Paris, 1949), pp. 64–5; H.-Ch. Peuch, 'Le Manichéisme', *Histoire des Religions*, vol. II (Paris, 1972), p. 630; S. Runciman, *Le Manichéisme médiéval* (Paris, 1949), pp. 14–16, 20, 37–47; Ostrogorsky, *Histoire de l'état byzantin*, pp. 295–6.

72 For Orthodoxy and other sects in the Ottoman Empire see O. Clément, *Byzance et le Christianisme* (Paris, 1964); J. Guillard, 'L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XIIe siècle', *Travaux et Mémoires* I (Paris, 1965), 299–324; Jarry, *Hérésies et factions*; V. E. Kaegi, *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium* (Chicago, 1982); R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, vol. III: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1969).

The state and the Muslim population

The assertions of some of the older generation of western historians that the Turkish states in Anatolia followed a policy of enforced Islamisation of the local population have long since been disproved by western historians such as Claude Cahen, Bernard Lewis and Marshall G. Hodgson, and Turkish historians such as Fuad Köprülü and Osman Turan. Young western historians now generally approach this subject with greater care and objectivity.

The process of Turkification and Islamisation from the end of the eleventh century encompassed a wide area from the Byzantine frontiers to the borders of Iran, from the shores of the Black Sea to the lands of the Ayyubid state. This area was divided between the Anatolian Seljuk state in the west, the Danişmends in the centre, and the Mengüceks, the Saltukids, the Artukids and others in the east. Each one of these followed a clear religious policy in the regions under their own control.⁷³ The target of this religious policy was two groups, that is, the Muslims and the non-Muslims.

These states aimed rapidly to make the nomadic and settled Turkish populations productive by giving them land – valleys, plains and summer pastures – to settle in the eastern, south-eastern and central regions of Anatolia. There is no doubt that the *vakıf* foundations were highly significant in realising this extremely important policy. Even though the foundation dates of the *vakıf* buildings of the states mentioned above which have survived are not known today, it is clear that the conquest and settlement movements which came immediately afterwards followed a line progressing from east to west. Looking at the existing architectural works, it is possible to say that in the east, the region of Lake Van, and in the centre, the inner section of the Kızılırmak (Halys) river were the places settled first and, in parallel with this, Turkified and Islamised.

It is clear that the states which we are discussing had control over a large Muslim population, the majority of which was made up of Turks. All these states, as a continuation of the Great Seljuk state, identified themselves with Sunni Islam. Babinger's assertion, mentioned above, that the Anatolian Seljuks were Shi'i, was not based on any historical evidence and has not so far been proved.⁷⁴ Although the Anatolian Seljuk rulers had a Sunni Islamic culture and education and knew Arabic and Persian well enough to write poetry in these languages, neither they nor the population were particularly strict in religious interpretation, being neither conservative nor fanatical. It is for this reason

⁷³ See note 27 above for bibliographical references.

⁷⁴ Babinger, 'Der Islām in Kleinasien'.

that contemporary Arab opinion viewed the Turkish understanding of Islam with suspicion and the Turks' 'Muslim-ness' was questioned.⁷⁵

In order to legitimise their rule within the Islamic world and develop the urban centres under their control, the Anatolian Seljuk rulers and the Turkoman leaders of the beyliks laid the ground for attracting Turkish, Persian and Arab men of learning and religion, Sufis, poets and writers to work and write for them. Many members of the *ulema*, such as Abdülmecid b. İsmâ'il Herevi (d. 1142), Muhammad Talakani (d. 1217), Yusuf b. Sa'îd el-Sijistani (d. 1241–2) and Ömer el-Ebheri (d. 1265), therefore came from Iran and the Arab regions and settled in Anatolia in the Anatolian Seljuk period. One prominent figure in the time of the Sökmenids was the scholar of religious law in Ahlat, Abussamed b. Abdurrahman (d. 1145). Further, there were Turkish scholars settled in various Arab regions who had been trained in Seljuk *medreses* in Anatolia. All these men played an important role in the strengthening of the Sunni policy of the state.

During the period of their establishment, the Ottomans took over and continued this tolerant Sunni policy. As is well known, the first Ottoman rulers adopted a tolerant stance towards the Kalenderis, Hayders, Vefais, the Bektaşis and other Sufi circles which did not fit well with Sunnism, granting them many *vakıfs* and benefiting greatly from their support, particularly in the conquest of the Balkans. This tolerant policy of the early rulers continued until the beginnings of Safavi Shi'i propaganda in Anatolia at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

*Religious leanings and mezheps: the establishment of
Sunnism in Turkey in the Middle Ages*

There is no doubt that from the time of the Seljuks of Iran the political administrations' protection of the official policy of Sunnism was a factor in the strengthening of Sunnism among the other *mezheps* in the Middle East.⁷⁶ As a newly established state in the centre of the Islamic world with a non-settled population of non-Arab origin, the Iranian Seljuks were initially compelled to guarantee their political legitimacy by making themselves accepted and, thus, to back Sunnism. At the same time, the great majority of the Turkish groups

75 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 204; Cahen, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, p. 164. Despite the hundreds of years that have passed since then, the Turks in Turkey are still today not counted as good Muslims in a section of Arab public opinion.

76 Some assertions have been made that the political administrations forced the population to be Sunni in order to protect the official policy of Sunnism. Based on no historical foundation or data, these assertions have not so far been proved.

chose Sunnism when they began gradually from the tenth century to convert to Islam because they came into contact with the circles in Transoxania in which Sunni Islam was the most powerful religion, and even if they initially met with various problems, they had no great difficulty, at least in elite circles, in adopting it.

Thus as a natural result of these historical developments the great majority of this Muslim population in Anatolia of Central Asian origins followed Sunni Islam. One can safely say that throughout Anatolia in the Seljuk and the Ottoman periods the Hanefi branch of Sunnism was dominant in education and teaching, and particularly in law, even if in some places in the south and the south-east Shafi'ism was widespread. The cities and towns, that is, places which had a developed culture and the areas in their vicinity, in other words regions which had contact with written culture, were normally locations where Sunnism predominated. This also naturally applied to the villages which were close to these centres and which had continuous relations with them. It cannot have been the case, however, taking into consideration the conditions of the time, that the Sunnism of the rural areas was bound to the bookish or *medrese*-based Sunnism of the city. What we can say, looking at examples which still exist today, is that, even if not to the same extent as in heterodox circles, traditional beliefs and customs were dominant to some degree, at least in a widespread and strong saint cult. Despite the passing to a strict Sunnism in the sixteenth century in the Ottoman period and the attainment of an advanced level of literacy, the fact that this position has not changed even today legitimises this view. Nevertheless, the assertion that all the rural portion of the population belonged to a heterodox Islam remains unsupported by any historical data.

In any case, the vast majority in Anatolia did in principle adopt Sunni Islam and Hanefism. Thus, if Shafi'ism is put to one side, the other Sunni *mezheps* (Hanbali and Maliki) did not find fertile ground in Anatolia. Even if from time to time over the centuries scholars and Sufis of these two *mezheps* travelled to the region, or even settled or lived there for long periods working as high-ranking bureaucrats or in the educational life of the *medreses*, these *mezheps* were not widespread. It has been suggested that this was the result of the Turks' contacts with Hanefi circles in Central Asia during the period in which they were converting to Islam, which thus enabled this *mezhep* better to put down roots and firmly establish its culture. A further, equally important reason was that this *mezhep* was more rational and more able to meet the Turks' practical needs; in other words it was better adapted to Turkish social structure.

The Shi'i question in medieval Turkey

The subject of the religious trends and *mezheps* outside Sunni Islam is one that is little understood from the point of view of Turkish religious history and which has hardly been researched at all. There is a considerable lack of information on it in the sources for the Seljuk and beylik periods in Anatolia. Despite much research having been done on the period in general, many specific questions remained unanswered. One of these is the question of Shi'ism in Anatolia.⁷⁷ While it has long been known that a substantial proportion of the Turkoman who came into Anatolia, particularly with the nomadic movements of the thirteenth century, had an understanding of Islam which did not fit well with Sunni Islam, and that some Turkoman were active in political and social movements and in religious and Sufi trends, the insufficiency of the written sources on this subject for the period mean that it is not clearly or completely understood to what extent, where and in which circles these trends were influential. But using clues and data concerning the position today, some hypotheses can be produced about the type and content of these movements.

However insufficient the sources may be, it is still possible to see traces of Shi'i-Ismaili influences among the semi-nomadic Turks, regardless of the Sunni policy of the political administrations which officially protected it, influences which were not considered by researchers until the recent past. We must remember that the Turkoman who were present in northern Syria and south-east Anatolia from the eleventh century had lived for a considerable period side by side with the Ismailis and had even intermixed with them.⁷⁸ Thus al-Jawbari, an Arab who travelled among them at the beginning of the thirteenth century claiming that Ali's soul had passed to him, wrote that he wandered among the people without being found in any way odd.⁷⁹ In this context the dominance of a strong messianism in the revolts against the Mongols in Anatolia in the following years, including the Babai revolt in 1240 and the Cimri revolt which succeeded it, is striking.⁸⁰

Although we can presume that the Ilkhan ruler Öljeitü Hudabende's (1304–16) acceptance of the İmamiye *mezhep* resulted in a environment favourable to

77 For Claude Cahen's argument on this subject see his article 'Le problème du Shiisme dans l'Asie Mineure turque pré-ottomane', *Le Shiisme Imamite (Colloque de Strasbourg 1968)* (Paris, 1970), pp. 115–29.

78 See F. Daftary, *The Ismā'īlīs: Their History and Doctrine* (Cambridge, 2001) pp. 356, 374.

79 See 'Abd al-Rahim b. 'Umar al-Jawbari, *Al-Mukhtar fī Kashf al-Asrar wa Hatk al-Astar*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Karaçelebizâde), no. 253, f. 39a. Claude Cahen was one of the first scholars to refer to this source.

80 Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul*, pp. 75–80.

the spreading of Shi'ism in Anatolia, the subsequent rapid shift of the Ilkhans to Sunnism must have hindered any such development. Further, the Anatolian Turkoman rulers, who were, as we have said, dominated by strong messianic beliefs, did not enter this *mezhep* despite being in close contact with Shi'i-Ismaili influences, but rather preserved their old pre-Islamic beliefs under an Islamic veneer. With the development of Bektāṣi and Kızılbaş movements in the fifteenth century among those Turkoman and Kurdish tribes in Anatolia who are known to have been the object of probably strong Ismaili influence in the thirteenth century and of Hurufi propaganda which was highly influenced by Ismailism in the fourteenth century, the Anatolian branch of heterodoxy appeared.⁸¹

Despite the existence of such influences we have no proof of the diffusion of either Ismaili Shi'ism or Īmamiye (Twelver Shi'ism) in Anatolia in this period. Thus, no Shi'i groups belonging directly to either of these branches existed in Anatolia, even in the following centuries.

There were, however, Yazidi circles which were sufficiently numerous to be involved in a series of political incidents which broke out in the east and south-east of Anatolia in the second half of the thirteenth century. Developed in the twelfth century by *ṣeyh* Adi ibn Musafir (d. 1162) with the aim of defending the Ummayyad Caliphs, in particular Yazid I, by opposing the extremism of the Shi'i *mezheps*, the Adeviyye *mezhep* gradually changed its character among the mountain Kurds in the south-east of Anatolia and, combining with former local beliefs, became an extreme heterodox *mezhep*. In the time of the grandsons of *ṣeyh* Adi ibn Musafir the *mezhep* took the name Yazidiye from Caliph Yazid and its followers began to be known as Yazidis. They joined with the Turkoman and fought together against the Mongols who were occupying Anatolia. Yazidi identity as it exists today emerged fully at the end of the fourteenth century.⁸² The *mezhep* did not extend beyond the south-east of Anatolia and there is no trace whatsoever of the existence of Yazidism in the western parts of Anatolia today.

The state and non-Muslims

Here, even if only briefly, it is necessary to touch on the religious policy which the political administrations followed towards the non-Muslim population in Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. A non-Muslim subject population

81 See in particular J. K. Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (Hartford, Conn., 1937); I. Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach: un mythe et ses avatares: genèse et evolution du Soufisme populaire en Turquie* (Leiden, 1998).

82 For the Yazidis see note 22 above.

of significant size, even if less than in previous periods, and made up of Orthodox Greeks (Rum), Gregorian Armenians, Georgians, Suriyanis, Nestorians, monophysite Jacobites and others lived in the lands over which these states ruled. The Turkish rulers were therefore well aware of the need to protect and look after their non-Muslim subjects in order to preserve social order, thus allowing the Turkish population, the vast majority of which was semi-nomadic, to adapt to their new life in the new lands and to become productive. This depended on not destabilising the existing social and economic structure.

With this aim in mind, therefore, almost all the Seljuk sultans left the non-Muslims undisturbed as far as possible. They did not strictly enforce the law related to the *ahl al-dhimma* (the non-Muslim population) which was firmly implemented by other Muslim countries, and adopted a policy designed to assure ease of relations, a policy known in the Ottoman period as *istimalet* (persuasion). After his military expedition into the Menderes valley in the west of Anatolia in 1196, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, for example, settled a large group of Rum villagers whom he brought to Akşehir from the Menderes valley, gave them materials and equipment for arable agriculture, and exempted them from tax for a considerable period.⁸³ In the east the Artukid ruler Balak Gazi deported the Gerger Armenians who had revolted against him to the region of Hanazıt, but adopted a tolerant policy towards them thereafter and interfered as little as possible in their religious life. The sources show that the period of one of the Artukid rulers, Necmeddin Alp (1152–76), was one of the most prosperous for the Christians of the region. Similarly, the reigns of Emir Saltuk (1145–76) and the Ahlat ruler Sökmen II (1128–83) were periods in which the Christians of eastern Anatolia lived peacefully. Further, the Danişmends who, as is clear from the famous epic romance known as the *Danişmendname*, were tightly tied to the *cihad* and *gazi* ideology, behaved very tolerantly towards the Christians, so much so that according to the account given by Michael, the Suriyani historian of the period, they were overcome with grief at the death of Gümüştekin Ahmed Gazi in 1104.⁸⁴ From the first conquests on, the Christian population, particularly those belonging to the 'heretical' churches in the rural regions, did not feel great hostility towards the Turks, and, as explained above, regarded the wars which the Turks won against the Byzantines as punishing Byzantium, which looked down on and oppressed them.

⁸³ See Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, p. 292.

⁸⁴ See Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche* (1166–1199), ed. and tr. J. Chabot, 5 vols. (Paris, 1899–1924), II, p. 195; Matthew of Edessa, *Recit de la première croisade, extrait de la chronique de Matthieu d'Edesse*, tr. E. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858), p. 256.

The Anatolian Seljuks and Turkoman beyliks were able, thanks to their more flexible application of the law relating to the *ahl al-dhimma* in comparison with other contemporary Muslim states, to incorporate the non-Muslim populations of Anatolia into their own economic and social system. This policy towards the non-Muslims occasioned some criticism. The famous Sufi Muhieddin İbn Arabi complained in a letter he wrote to İzzeddin Keykavus I that

the sultan, who is the shadow of God on earth, must raise the honour and the glory of Islam, he must work for the total domination of the infidels, churches must be destroyed in towns in which the Muslims rule, the bells in those which are not destroyed must be rung very softly, Christians must not mount horses or donkeys using saddles, they must not carry weapons, they must respectfully stop in places when Muslims pass, they must not go around in Muslim clothes, and they must not use Arabic seals.⁸⁵

Despite any such criticism, there is no doubt that this realistic and intelligent policy was a factor which strengthened the existence of these states. From a political point of view it successfully removed possible Byzantine claims over the Christian population living under Turkish rule. In other words, the non-Muslim population which had begun to live under Turkish control must from then on have largely disregarded Byzantium as its protector and refuge.

It can be said that the period of Mongol occupation which began in reality in Anatolia in 1246 ensured a more varied environment for non-Muslims when compared with earlier periods. When they took the Anatolian Seljuk state under their rule, the Mongols were still shamans and for a time they remained indifferent to both Islam and Christianity. Wishing to benefit from this situation, the Armenians approached the Mongols. It is probable that the Mongols were both attentive to the Rum and used the Georgians as soldiers in their armies in order to weaken the influence of the Seljuk administration over the population and to ensure their own better relations with the local inhabitants. Thus the Christian groups succeeded to an extent in securing new privileges from the Mongols and in using them against the Turks. As an example we can point to the restoration of various bishoprics removed by the Turks. But this novel situation which began with the Mongol occupation continued only until

85 For a summary of the text of the letter see Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr: Moğollar Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*, ed. O. Turan (Ankara, 1944), Persian text, p. 328; cf. Togan, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*, p. 213. Togan interprets this letter as a sign of İbn Arabi's fanaticism, although we think it useful in this context to recall that İbn Arabi lived in Andalusia in a period when Catholic oppression of the Jews and the Muslims during the *reconquista* was increasing, and that he came to Anatolia from there.

their acceptance of Islam, for Gazan Han's conversion and official recognition of Sunnism in 1296 speeded up the spreading of this new religion among the nomadic Mongol tribes. These tribes, who had followed their shamanist way of life since their arrival on the Anatolian steppe, generally likened the Turkoman *babas* to their own shamans, as Fuad Köprülü said, and for this reason they started to convert to Islam through the Turkoman *babas* whom they felt close to, and began gradually to settle on the land.

*The vibrant Sufi environment of medieval Turkey: the entry
and spread of Sufism in Anatolia*

After the completion of the conquest of a large part of Anatolia and the stabilising and strengthening of the political and social environment, that is, approximately from the beginning of the thirteenth century, the dervishes and *şeyhs*, members of various Sufi movements and *tarikats*, entered Anatolia and began to settle. These Sufis found there a favourable environment for the spreading of Sufism, while the political leaders in turn received valuable spiritual support which strengthened their presence and legitimised them in the eyes of the population.

These mystics, Sufis, *şeyhs* and dervishes coming from a different circle and with a different outlook, speaking different languages and wearing different clothes, came in with the nomadic waves discussed above, and settled. Those from the towns settled in urban centres, and those from rural regions, in the countryside. Thus both high (urban) and popular (rural) Sufism began to be brought into the Anatolian lands from other parts of the Islamic world. High Sufi circles generally had a strong moral character in which the understanding of ascetism (*zühhd ve takva*) was very influential. Only Mevlana would be an exception to this. In this context we should call to mind among others Muhieddin İbn Arabi (d. 1241), his successor Sadreddin Konevi (d. 1274), and their disciples, and the members of the Kadiriye and the Rifaiye *tarikats*.⁸⁶

A further Sufi group was that which was known as Horasani because the majority of its members followed a Sufi understanding that was dominant in Transoxiana, Iran and particularly in the region of Horasan. Fuad Köprülü stressed the important fact that this group at one time had a great influence in the Middle East, and in particular among the Sufi movements in Anatolia. The extent of this influence was such that even today many Turkish families link their own roots to this region. There were

86 A. T. Karamustafa, 'Origins of Anatolian Sufism', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Y. Ocak (Ankara, 2005), pp. 67–96. The article gives a new and interesting picture of the roots of Anatolian Sufism.

many different Sufi trends present in this group. Among its most famous proponents were Evhadeddin Kirmani (d. 1237), who came to Anatolia and lived there, Fahreddin Iraki, the father of Mevlana Bahaeddin Veled (d. 1238), Burhaneddin Tirmizi (d. 1240) and Necmeddin Razi (Daye) (d. 1256).

The *şeyhs* and dervishes associated with various *tarikats* which were part of these Sufi movements were active in important centres of the period such as Ahlat, Erzurum, Bayburt, Sivas, Tokat, Amasya, Kırşehir, Kayseri, Konya and in the neighbouring regions, and created a very lively Sufi environment in Turkey in the thirteenth century. These captivating figures, wandering the markets dressed in their unusual clothing and with their remarkable appearance, preaching, singing religious songs, organising animated religious ceremonies in the *tekkes* and *zaviyes* which they established, and expounding novel ideas about creation, God, humanity and the universe, must have greatly attracted the attention of the people.

This process resulted in the emergence of a ‘popular’ Islam which, centred on saint cults and emphasising saintly exploits, legends and beliefs known in *medrese* circles as superstition (*hurafe*) or heresy (*bid’at*), differed from *medrese* Islam based on *fikih* (*fiqh*, Islamic canonical jurisprudence). The interpretation and practice of these two forms of Islam, as in every Muslim country, both co-existed and competed over the centuries. It is obvious that Anatolia could not remain unaffected by this sociological process which occurred in a similar way in all the lands into which Islam spread. The Balkan conquests in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries took with them the same understanding of Islam, which was then enriched by new elements from this region. This popular Islam, centred on a saint cult, is still strong in Turkey today where it retains the same characteristics.

Tarikats and Sufi circles

It would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that Sufism, which we have shown to have been entirely brought from outside into medieval Turkey with the migrations at the beginning of the thirteenth century, included nearly all the Muslim groups in that period and alone represented Islam. In other words, Islam in Anatolia meant Sufism. The Mongol occupation of Central Asia and, shortly afterwards, of Iran and Iraq unsettled many mystics, Sufi *şeyhs* and dervishes, and drove them into Anatolia which was made attractive to them by the Anatolian Seljuk state’s establishment and development there. The most important of these groups were the urban Sunni *tarikats* of Central Asian origin such as the Kübreviye and Yeseviye, and of Iraqi origin such as the Sühreverdiye and Rifaiye. The *tarikats* of these countries, which were able to

appeal to both rural and urban circles, such as the Hayderiye, Kalenderiye and Vefaiye, the majority of which remained outside Sunnism, also surged into Anatolia.⁸⁷

This second group of *tarikats* was much better able to establish itself among the numerous nomadic caravans driven forward by the Mongol invasions, and among the rural sections of the Turkoman communities in the thirteenth century because, as these people had either only recently accepted Islam or, because of their semi-nomadic way of life, were only superficially Islamised, they had been unable to assimilate to Islam to the extent that the settled population had. In any case, for these people Sufism probably meant little more than a form of social life, rather than being a means of attaining any mystic goals. The great majority of them, such as the Vefaiye, Kalenderiye and Hayderiye, were *tarikats* which could easily accommodate the local pre-Islamic beliefs and traditions.

Kübreviye, an important urban Asian *tarikat* founded by the important Sufi Necmeddin Kübra (d. 1221), was brought into Anatolia by famous individuals such as Sadeddin Hamevi, who had been intellectually raised by Necmeddin Kübra, Seyfeddin Bakharzi and Baba Kemal-i Hocendi.⁸⁸ These men escaped before the Mongols and took refuge in Anatolia together with their disciples. Among them we should note in particular Necmeddin Razi (Daye) and Bahaeddin Veled who were largely responsible for the spread of the Kübreviye in Anatolia.

Necmeddin Razi came to Kayseri where he met Alaeddin Keykubad I. From there he moved to Sivas where he wrote his famous work *Mirsad al-'Ibad*. Bahaeddin Veled settled first in Karaman, and then moved to Konya where he remained until his death. Bahaeddin Veled, who was a very respected scholar, aroused much interest there and had many disciples. He was particularly influential over his son Celaeddin Muhammed, especially in relation to Sufi

87 For the Haydariye and Kalenderiye see Köprülü, 'Anadolu'da İslâmiyet', pp. 299–302; A. Y. Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Marjinal Süfîlik: Kalanderîler* (Ankara, 1999); A. T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Later Period, 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City, 1994); Karamustafa, 'Origins of Anatolian Sufism'; A. Y. Ocak, 'The Wafâ'î tarîqa (Wafâ'iyya) During and After the Period of the Seljuks of Turkey: a New Approach to the History of Popular Mysticism in Turkey', *Mésogeios* 25–26 (2005), 209–48.

88 For Necmeddin Kübra and the Kübreviye see Lami'i Çelebi, *Nafahat Al-Uns* (Istanbul, AH 1270), pp. 475–9; Taqi al-din Subki, *Tabaqat al-Shafi'iyyat al-Kubra*, vol. V (Beirut, n.d.), p. 11; Haririzade Kemaleddin, *Tibyanu Vasail al-Hakaik*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (İbrahim Efendi), no. 432, vol. III, ff. 79–85; H. Corbin, *L'homme de lumière dans le soufisme iranien*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1971), I, pp. 95–147; M. Mole, 'Les Kubrawis entre Sunnisme et Shiisme aux VIIIe et IXe siècle de l'Hégire', in *Revue des Études Islamiques* 29 (1961), 61–142; E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 491–4; H. Algar, 'Kubrâ', *El2*, v, pp. 299–301.

education.⁸⁹ The very widespread view that Celaleddin Muhammed encountered Sufism after he came to know Şems-i Tebrizi and through his influence is incorrect. Celaleddin Muhammed himself acknowledges in the work of Eflaki (author of *Manakib al-Arifin*, written for Mevlana's grandson Ulu Arif Çelebi) the extent to which his father Bahaeddin Veled was an influence on him. Bahaeddin Veled had at least as wide a circle of followers as his *halife* (an officially ordained successor or deputy of a Sufi *şeyh*) Burhaneddin Muhakkık-ı Tirmizi who came with him from Balkh.

The Sufi *tarikat* which was established by Abu Najib al-Suhrawardi (d. 1167) and was developed and spread by his nephew Shihab al-din Abu Hafs 'Umar al-Suhrawardi (d. 1234), possessed a strong Sunni character and was widespread and developed in Anatolia. Among the works written by Shihab al-din Abu Hafs 'Umar al-Suhrawardi, *'Awarif al-Ma'arif* won great renown and became one of the most widely read Sufi works in Anatolia. It had considerable influence on Sufi works written in Turkey both at that time and later.⁹⁰ Even if these urban *tarikats* which represented high Sufism were not as widespread in Anatolia as the Rifaiye and Kadiriye, yet the books written by their founders very much influenced high Sufi circles and were textbooks for centuries.

Two important *tarikats*, the Nakşibendiye and Halvetiye, which again had Central Asian origins and Sunni leanings, were added in the later centuries to those *tarikats* coming from outside. These played a very important role in political, social and religious spheres in the beylik and Ottoman periods, both in Anatolia and in the Balkans, and have survived until today.⁹¹

Alongside these *tarikats* which came into the region from outside, new *tarikats* developed in Anatolia from the end of the thirteenth century. Among these one of the most striking was the Mevleviye, or Celaliye as it was known at that time. This *tarikat* began to spread quickly in the Turkoman beyliks in the west of Anatolia after the death of Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, thanks to the considerable efforts in the fourteenth century of his son Sultan Veled

89 Eflaki, *Manâkib al-'Arifin*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1959), I, pp. 48, 176.

90 For Shihab al-din Suhrawardi and his *tarikat* see Lami'i Çelebi, *Nafahat al-Uns*, pp. 526–7; H. Ritter, 'Die vier Suhrawardi', *Der Islam* 25 (1938), pp. 36–8; A. Hartmann, 'al-Suhrawardi', in *El2*, ix, pp. 778–82.

91 For the Nakşibendiye see the articles by Hamid Algar in *Naqshbandis: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman*, ed. M. Gaborieau, A. Popovic and Th. Zarcone (Istanbul and Paris, 1990). See also D. Le Gall, *The Ottoman Naqshbandiyya in the Pre-Mujaddidi Phase* (Michigan, 1996); *Naqshbandis: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman*, ed. Gaborieau et al. For the Halvetiye see in particular H. J. Kissling, 'Aus der Geschichte des Chalvetijje-Ordens', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 103 (1953), 233–89; N. Clayer, *Mystiques, état et société: les Halvetis dans l'air balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours* (Leiden, 1994); F. De Jong, 'Khalwatiyya', in *El2*, iv, pp. 991–3.

and grandson Ulu Arif Çelebi. This urban *tarikāt*, which gained influence in the Ottoman Empire only after the mid-fifteenth century, showed great development in the seventeenth century and experienced the most successful period of its history in this and the following centuries.⁹²

Another local *tarikāt* which was at least as important in the history of Anatolia as the Mevleviye and was even more widespread in the rural areas was the Bektaşī, which developed in a completely different environment and with a totally different social base, and had a different Sufi outlook. This *tarikāt* was not linked directly to either the time or outlook of the thirteenth-century Turkoman *şeyh* Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli from whom it took its name. Beginning from the period when it was officially established in the sixteenth century, it was one of the most influential *tarikats* in the Ottoman period in rural and even urban sectors of Anatolia and the Balkans.⁹³

The influential Sufis of medieval Anatolia

Muhieddin İbn Arabi and *vahdet-i vücūd* (monism)

After a period in the Seljuk capital Konya, Muhieddin İbn Arabi settled in Damascus at the invitation of the Ayyubid prince al-Malik al-Ashraf in 1223 and lived there until his death in 1241. It was here that he wrote a part of his works.⁹⁴ The ideas of *Vücūdiyye* or *vahdet-i vücūd* (*wahda al-wujūd*) (monism), which first began to appear in the doctrines of Sufis such as Bayazid Bistami (d. 874) and Junayd Baghdadi (d. 910) and which reached a turning point with the famous pronouncement ‘ana al-haqq’ (I am the truth) of Mansur-e Hallaj (d. 922), became a systematic theosophic definition thanks to Muhieddin İbn Arabi, even if he

92 See Sâkib Dede, *Safina-i Nafisa-i Mawlawiyan*, 3 vols. (Cairo, AH 1283); A. Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ’dan Sonra Mevlevîlik* (Istanbul, 1953); E. Vitray-Meyerovitch, *Mystique et poésie en Islam: Djalâl-ud-Dîn Rûmî et l’Ordre des Derviches Tourneurs* (Paris, 1972); T. Yazıcı and F. De Jong, ‘Mawlawiyya’, in *El2*, vi, pp. 883–8. See also Franklin D. Lewis, *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West: the Life, Teaching and Poetry of Jalâl al-Din Rumi* (Oxford, 2000). For an overview of the *tarikats* in Anatolia and the Balkans in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries see O. Türer, ‘General Distributions of the Sufi Orders in Ottoman Anatolia’, in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. Ocak, pp. 219–60; N. Clayer and A. Popovic, ‘Les turques dans les Balkans a l’époque ottomane’, in *ibid.*, pp. 261–78.

93 Apart from the references given in note 81 above, see S. Faroqi, *Der Bektaschi Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826)* (Vienna, 1980); A. Popovic and G. Veinstein (eds.), *Bektachhiyya: études sur l’ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant Hadji Bektach* (Istanbul, 1995); R. Tschudi, ‘Bektâshiyya’, *El2*, i, pp. 1161–3.

94 For Muhieddin İbn Arabi see the following important works: A. E. Afifi, *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Dîn Ibnul Arabî* (Cambridge, 1939); O. Yahya, *Histoire et classification de l’œuvre d’İbn Arabî*, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1964); H. Corbin, *L’imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d’İbn Arabî* (Paris, 1958); M. Chodkiewicz, *Le sceau des saints: prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d’İbn Arabî* (Paris, 1986); M. Chodkiewicz, *Un océan sans rivage* (Paris, 1992); W. C. Chittik, *Ibn Arabî’s Metaphysics of Imagination: the Sufi Path of Knowledge* (Albany, 1989). See also A. Ateş, ‘İbn al-‘Arabî’, in *El2*, iii, pp. 707–11.

never used this term. The idea of *vahdet-i vücud*, often incorrectly confused with pantheism, was in essence a very complicated idea and difficult to explain. It can be summarised roughly as meaning that everything in the universe is a manifestation of God who is the single creator, and since existence is God, all existence is in truth nothing other than his existence. This system, which attained a broad synthesis as a result of Muhieddin İbn Arabi's knowledge of philosophy, calligraphy, religious law (*fıkıh*), *hadith*, *tesfir* (commentary on the Quran), literature and various occult sciences of the time, became so influential that it affected not just the Sufi understanding of the period but also Sufi interpretation in almost the entire Islamic world down to today. For this reason it is probably correct to define Muhieddin İbn Arabi as the greatest Sufi of all time.

Apart from his two very well known works *Fusus al-Hikam* and *al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya*, his treatises (*risale*) and his other works which numbered around a hundred, later works attributed to him also appeared. Even if Muhieddin İbn Arabi was accused in his own time of atheism (*zendeka ve ilhad*) by Islamic *ulema* and a section of conservative Sufis and was even remembered as the most infidel *şeyh* (*el-Şeyh el-Ekfer*) because the expressions in his works are obscure and difficult to understand, he was popularly known as *el-Şeyh el-Ekber* (the greatest *şeyh*) and every section of the population showed great respect towards him, as people do even today. It was his adopted child and *halife* (caliph, successor), the famous thirteenth-century Sufi Sadreddin Konevi, who secured fundamental prestige for Muhieddin İbn Arabi in Anatolia and ensured the spreading of his thought by making it comprehensible through the commentaries he wrote on his works.⁹⁵ Owing to the efforts of Sadreddin Konevi, the thought of this great Sufi influenced all Sunni and heterodox circles in Anatolia in the Seljuk period and had a significant impact on both the elite circles and the popular classes.

Together with Sadreddin Konevi, others too represented the *vahdet-i vücud* school of thought in Anatolia, among the best-known of whom were Müeyyedüddin el-Cendi, Sadeddin el-Fergani and Afifeddin el-Tilemsani. They, and the disciples they trained, opened *zaviyes* in important cultural centres of the period such as Konya, Sivas and Erzincan, and spread the *vahdet-i vücud* school of thought through their training of disciples, commentaries on the works of the *şeyhs* and the composition of their own works. The Middle East thus quickly came under the influence of this school of thought, which moved

⁹⁵ Lami'î Çelebi, *Nafahat Al-Uns*, pp. 632–4; O. Ergin, 'Sadreddin el-Kunawî ve Eserleri', *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1957), 63–90; W. C. Chittik, 'Sadr al-Dîn Kûnawî on the Oneness of Being', *International Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1981), 171–84.

from there into other areas. But for us what is fundamentally important is that the thought of Muhieddin İbn Arabi did not remain restricted only to the high echelons of Sufism, but was also successful in influencing popular Sufism, and the success of such a complex theosophic system as *vahdet-i vücud* should be stressed.

The impact of Muhieddin İbn Arabi's thought was, moreover, felt beyond the various Sufi and popular circles,⁹⁶ for, thanks to its not being well understood and being interpreted in an extreme fashion as akin to pantheism (thus giving further reason for its absorption into the confused ideology of various popular movements, the most typical of which was the sixteenth-century Melami movement), it remained influential throughout the entire Ottoman period.⁹⁷ The Melami *tarikât* continues to exist and retains a Sufi character which still has its supporters among some intellectual circles in Turkey today.

Mevlana Celaleddin Muhammed Rumi and divine love (*ilahi aşk*) Another Sufi understanding which attracted a great following in Anatolia was that of Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi (d. 1273) who turned the *vahdet-i vücud* into an exuberance of divine love which became the centre of his Sufi vision. Although he was a member of the school of thought of Muhieddin İbn Arabi, his popularity was far greater, for among all the Sufis of the Islamic world, it is Mevlana about whom most has been said and written.

As a child, Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi fled from Balkh with his father, Bahaeddin Veled, to the Hejaz and on to Anatolia to escape the Mongol invasions. He received a good education in the important centres of learning of the time, such as Damascus and Aleppo, and became an expert in the science of the Shari'a and particularly in the field of *fiqh*. He also received a Sufi education from his father. While he developed his own Sufi understanding, the type of education he received without doubt had a considerable influence, and it was as a result of this that he developed an understanding which remained faithful to Sunni Islam.⁹⁸

96 On this subject see H. Z. Ülken, 'École vudjudite et son influence dans la pensée turque', *Weiner Zeitschrift für der Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1969), 195–208; M. Tahrali, 'A General Outline of the Influence of Ibn 'Arabi on the Ottoman Era', *Journal of the Muhyi al-Din Ibn 'Arabi Society* 26 (1999), 43–54; M. Chodkievicz, 'Réception de la doctrine d'Ibn 'Arabi dans le monde ottoman', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. Ocak, pp. 97–120.

97 See A. Y. Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler Yahut Dairenin Dışına Çıkanlar*, 3rd edn (Istanbul, 2003), pp. 251–327.

98 For Mevlana and his Sufi thought see R. A. Nicholson, *Rumi: Poet and Mystic*, 1207–73 (London, 1950); A. Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ Celâleddîn* (Istanbul, 1959), p. 328; B. Firuzanfer, *Zindagani-i Mawlânâ Jalâl al-dîn Muhammad*, 3 vols. (Tehran, AH 1354); Vitray-Meyerovitch,

While teaching in Konya in the early days of his career, Mevlana devoted himself to mysticism, influenced by an enthusiastic dervish called Şems-i Tebrizi and no doubt affected also by his father's teaching. His own natural attraction to mystic learning must also have played a part, for without this the teachings of Şems-i Tebrizi and his father would not have found such fertile soil. Indeed, this is clear throughout the well-known Mevlevi source, the *Manakib al-Arifin*.

Mevlana's inclusive ideology and his sincere lifestyle deeply influenced both the Muslim and non-Muslim populace, and attracted the high administrative circles, including the ruler of the time, and the intellectual groups. He is also known to have established close friendships with well-known Sufis of the period such as Sadreddin Konevi. His circle thus gradually widened, his Sufi understanding spread throughout Seljuk Anatolia, and he rose to the level of being a holy man (*veli*) revered not just by members of the upper echelons but also by sectors of the population which had different understandings of Islam.

Although works such as the *Mesnevi* (*Masnevi*), *Divan-i Kabir*, *Fihî ma fihî* and *Ruba'îyyat*, which made the Sufi understanding and thought of Mevlana known, were written in Persian, the influence of his thought was not restricted to the upper echelons of the period but, thanks to important Sufis such as Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa, was also highly influential among Turkoman circles. The famous Turkoman Sufi poet of the fourteenth century, Aşık Paşa, who defended the use of Turkish as opposed to Persian and Arabic in Anatolia, made much use of the thought of Mevlana in his work *Garibname* and showed a great appreciation of him. Yunus Emre, too, talks of him with great admiration.

Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa Another important Turkoman Sufi of Seljuk Anatolia who lived in the same period as Mevlana was Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli (d. 1271). The fact that he hardly appears in any source of the period indicates that he was not widely known in his lifetime. He owes his fame today to the Bektaşî *tarikat*, which bears his name but was actually founded at the beginning of the sixteenth century, although its roots are much older. It is highly likely that, beginning in the fourteenth century, Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli was enveloped in a totally legendary identity and that when the *tarikat* was established this very widespread legendary character was attached to it.

Mystique et poésie en Islam; A. Schimmel, *The Triumphal Sun: a Study of the Works of Jalaloddin Rumi* (Albany, 1993); A. Bausani, 'Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî', in *El2*, II, pp. 404–8.

Today the Bektaşis and the Kızılbaş in Anatolia revere him and hold him sacred not as a historical figure but as a legendary one.⁹⁹ For them Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli is 'Ali's reincarnation'.¹⁰⁰

Yunus Emre (d. 1310) was also an important Sufi who left his mark on Sufism in Anatolia in the Seljuk period and who had a wide influence both in his lifetime and in the following centuries. In contrast to Mevlana, he was raised and lived in the countryside. According to Fuad Köprülü, this great Turkoman *şeyh* was a follower of Ahmed-i Yesevi (d. 1167) in Anatolia.¹⁰¹

The period of Yunus Emre's youth coincides with the old age of Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. His works entitled *Divan* and *Risalat al-Nushiyye* have survived to this day,¹⁰² as have the works of poets who, inspired by his influence and by the admiration they had for him, imitated his style. Like Mevlana, Yunus Emre was a follower of the *vahdet-i vücud* school of thought of Muhieddin İbn Arabi and, thanks to his poetry making this idea easily understandable, he played an important role in the history of Sufism in Anatolia. He was also considerably influenced by Mevlana.

Aşık Paşa was a very interesting Sufi in the context of the period in which he lived, when medieval Turkey had yet to overcome the social, political and religious upheavals it was experiencing. He was the only Sufi Turkoman from the descendants of Baba İlyas who rose in revolt against the Anatolian Seljuk administration in 1240. He received a good education and was highly influenced by the Sufi environment created by important Sufis such as Mevlana, Yunus Emre and Ahi Evren. It is possible that he felt insecure throughout his life owing to political suspicion of his family's past. As will be seen below, he was vehemently against the widespread use of Persian and Arabic in Anatolia and strongly advocated writing in Turkish. It was this attitude which led to the writing of the substantial *Garibname*.¹⁰³

99 On this subject see in particular Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*.

100 The only scholar to examine this subject in detail is I. Mélikoff, 'La divinisation de 'Ali chez les Bektachis-Alevis', in *From History to Theology: Ali in Islamic Beliefs*, ed. A. Y. Ocak (Ankara, 2005), pp. 83–110.

101 See Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, pp. 278–357. This work is still the first and most scholarly biography of Yunus Emre. For other detailed, scholarly biographies see A. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf* (Istanbul, 1961; repr. 1992); T. S. Halman, *The Humanist Poetry of Yunus Emre* (Istanbul, 1971); Halman (ed.), *Yunus Emre and his Mystical Poetry*, 2 vols. (Bloomington, 1989). Although there are today many works in Turkish on Yunus Emre, most of them are of an amateur and apologetic character.

102 Of the many editions of Yunus Emre's work, the best critical editions to date are *Yunus Emre Divanı*, ed. M. Tatçı, 3 vols. (Ankara, 1990); *Yunus Emre, Risâlat al-Nushiyya ve Divan*, ed. A. Gölpınarlı (Istanbul, 1965).

103 For Aşık Paşa and his works, and for bibliography, see F. İz, 'Aşik Pâshâ', *El2*, 1, pp. 689–99; Aşık Paşa, *Garib-Nâme*, ed. Kemal Yavuz, 4 vols. (Ankara, 2000).

Sufism and popular Islam

There is no doubt that among the most important social and cultural transformations in the history of Islam was the spreading of organised Sufi *tarikats* and their influence on the popular understanding of Islam. The most obvious sign of this was the extensive spread of saintly cults among the people almost everywhere throughout the Islamic world, and their dominance over literate, 'Quranic' Islam. The existence of one or several saints' *türbes* in almost every town and village in most Islamic countries is very striking. Islam in Turkey was no exception to this historical reality and such *türbes* are still to be found in all settlements of Anatolia today. The *türbes* of famous holy men who had died in towns and villages where their *türbes* were located became identified with the place itself. This was one of the typical characteristics of settlement units in Anatolia. A large number of these *türbes* date to the medieval period and usually indicate the first Muslim settlements in Anatolia.¹⁰⁴ They are thus important from a historical point of view.

Combining all aspects of the Islam of the population which had been in the Anatolian towns and villages for centuries, exhibiting Islamic characteristics and incorporating the remains of pre-Islamic beliefs and cults, the *türbes* can be seen as a centre of religious life. The face of popular Islam was different from that of the mosque. That to be found in the mosques was closer to the Islam of the book (the Quran); that in the *türbes* was closer to the pre-Islamic beliefs and practices or even those outside Islam. For this reason, the *ulema* in Anatolia, as in other Muslim countries, initiated a 'cold war' from Seljuk times to the present against this popular Islam which they called superstition and heresy (*hurafe* and *bid'at*). But this was a war the *ulema* never won.

Every *türbe* had its own origins, customs, rules of conduct and purpose for which it was visited going back beyond the Middle Ages.¹⁰⁵ These were taken more seriously than some Islamic commands and prohibitions, for those who visited the *türbes* both expected help from the saintliness of the holy man whose *türbe* it was, and feared any harm which might befall them. For this reason, most of those who did strictly adhere to the precepts of Islam were very careful not to violate the sanctity and privacy of the *türbe*.

¹⁰⁴ This subject has been carefully researched by F. V. Hasluck who used a wealth of data to be found in his work, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1929). See also Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, *passim*. For the Ottoman period the article of Ö. L. Barkan, 'İstila Devrinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), 279–353, is very important.

¹⁰⁵ H. Tanyu, *Ankara ve Çevresinde Adak ve Adak Yerleri* (Ankara, 1965), gives interesting and contemporary examples.

Shared social life and cultural influences

The Turks who came as conquerors to Anatolia soon became the new inhabitants and citizens of the region. Once the initial fighting and clashes had subsided and the Turks had settled, both sides then recognised and accepted each other's existence: the locals did not attempt to drive out the Turks, nor the Turks to drive out the locals. As the years passed, they began a process of recognising each other's culture, including their languages, religions and learning. This was a process which began simultaneously in both the urban and the rural areas, particularly in the villages. The only people to remain aloof from the Muslim urban circles or from the local population were the nomadic Turkomans. The urban and village Turks, however, the Rum, Armenians, Suriyanis and others were not slow to see the inevitability of co-existence, made clear to them in their town and village life, in the markets, at weddings, religious and seasonal festivals, and to see the usefulness of it. The closeness between the Muslim and Christian perceptions of the population eased the process of living together, as did the Seljuk sultans' policy of friendliness and tolerance to their non-Muslim subjects, a policy which drew a negative reaction from Muslim Arabs. As observed above, the Christianity of the Anatolian population was created from an amalgam of the influences of old pagan cults and local religions with Christianity. A similar process applied, too, to popular Islam. Thus, the formation in the towns and villages of an Islam and a Christianity which tended to superstition, outside the *medreses* and political government circles, brought the two peoples close to each other.¹⁰⁶

The result of Muslim Turks and Christian Rum, Armenians and other Christian groups living together side by side was naturally, over time, a certain exchange in cultural relations. But in this exchange who took what from whom, what was taken and what given, and to what extent it was taken and given has been a subject of debate among Turkish and western historians. Thanks to the considerable progress which has been made in Islamology and Turkology today it is at least now known that the Turks who arrived in Anatolia were not a primitive tribe equipped with only a very basic culture, as was argued by older-generation western historians, a view adopted as the result of either conscious prejudice or innocent superficiality of conviction. It is a historical fact which must be accepted that, in the words of Fuad Köprülü, the Turks came and settled in Anatolia 'as a group which had synthesised Islamic civilisation, which infused their entire way of life, with Turkish culture and

¹⁰⁶ Togan, *Umumî Türk Tarihine Giriş*, pp. 207–11; Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 223–44.

traditions'.¹⁰⁷ They cannot, thus, be seen as merely having been incorporated into and absorbed by the Christian culture of Anatolia. They did not become absorbed, for in Turkey today even the Muslims who are not of Turkish origin or the Christian population, while preserving their mother tongues, still mainly speak Turkish and write in Turkish, and most of the Muslims continue their ties, even if superficially, to Islam. The question, therefore, is not whether the cultural influence was or was not radical enough to change the essential identity of the Muslim Turks. The question is whether such an influence did or did not appear in aspects of daily life, particularly among the ordinary people, in types of food and drink, agricultural activities, housing structure, tools and material used, and in folkloric customs. From a sociological and historical point of view, here, as in all parts of the world, there were two-way influences. This can be seen in various local cultures and beliefs, especially among the lower echelons, where marriage with associated conversion was one of the most important factors reinforcing this two-way cultural exchange.

Shared cults, saintly pilgrimages and seasonal festivals

As a result of the relations with the local population which inevitably began shortly after their arrival, Turkish settlers in different areas came into contact with cults, beliefs and customs which pre-dated Christianity or dated from the Christian period. Even if not to the same degree in every region, they came over time to be aware of aspects of these cults, particularly in the towns, which resembled aspects of their own beliefs, and which attracted their interest. It was the same for the local population. This interest gradually opened the way to the birth of reciprocal exchange in saintly cults which both peoples revered and, thus, to shared saintly cults which both groups appropriated. This fusion around saintly cults which had already developed in Turkey in the Middle Ages attracted the attention of western travellers who came to Anatolia in the Ottoman period and who discussed it in their works.¹⁰⁸

As is well known, the first, and still the most comprehensive, research on this shared culture was undertaken by F. W. Hasluck. His research produced the most interesting results on this subject.¹⁰⁹ Hasluck, basing his arguments on convincing evidence, shows very clearly that just as, during the period of the conversion of the towns and villages of Anatolia to Christianity, the gods of the classical period, who now became Christian saints, were assured

¹⁰⁷ See Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, p. 191 n. 7.

¹⁰⁸ For the views of western observers on this subject see, for example, A. Y. Ocak, 'XIII–XV. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu'da Türk-Hristiyan Dinî Etkileşimler', *Belleten* 214 (1991), 661–73.

¹⁰⁹ Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya*.

a smooth transition, so too a similar process occurred in the conversion from Christianity to Islam. For example, the graves or tombs of certain Christian saints and particularly of martyrs of the early Christian era over time became saintly *türbes* among the Turks. These graves and tombs were thus transformed into shared pilgrimage sites of the two populations.¹¹⁰

It is important to remember that the *şeyhs* and dervishes of the popular Sufi circles, members of the syncretic *tarikats* which were not tied to Sunnism, such as, in particular, the Kalenderi and the Bektaşî, played a large role in this transformation. They benefited to a considerable degree from the saintly cults existing among the non-Muslim population in their spread of Islam. Thus, over time very many of these cults of Christian saints turned into an Islamic mystic cults. Some of the saintly *türbes* became, again over time, shared places of pilgrimage among the non-Muslim population. For example, the cult of St Charalambos in the region of Ürgüp was combined with that of Hacı Bektaş, that of St Theodor and St George in the region of Amasya with the cult of Baba İlyas, and, in the same way, the cult of Sarı Saltık joined with the cults of saints such as St Spiridon and St Nikola in various places in the Balkans.¹¹¹

Another typical example of this joint cultural, religio-social environment of the towns and villages of the Seljuk, beylik and early Ottoman period was the shared seasonal festivals. The most striking example of this is without doubt the spring festival which the Christians celebrated as Aya Yorgi (Hagios Georgios, St George) and the Muslim Turks as Hidrellez (Hızır-İlyas) on the same day, 6 May, and at which there were very similar customs. It is highly likely that this practice began earlier in the Anatolian Seljuk period. In the towns where they settled the Turks called the green and tree-filled open spaces, known by the name of Aya Yorgi where there was generally a small church, *hıdırlık*. They traditionally celebrated Hidrellez in these places. The legends of Aya Yorgi intermingled with the heroic deeds of Hızır-İlyas whose heroic deeds in turn intermingled with the legends of Aya Yorgi.¹¹²

Changes of religion: conversions and apostasy

This subject, which forms an important aspect of the socio-religious history of Anatolia, is one of the most sensitive areas for western historians.

110 Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya*.

111 See Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, p. 362 (for St Charalambos and Hacı Bektaş); H. Dernschvam, *Tagebuch*, ed. Franz Babinger (Munich, 1923), p. 202 (for St Theodor, St George and Baba İlyas); J. Deny, 'Sarı Saltık et le nom de la ville de Babadaghi', *Mélanges Emile Picot*, vol. II (Paris, 1913), pp. 12–14 (for Sarı Saltık, St Spiridon and St Nikola); A. Y. Ocak, *Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslâm'ın Balkanlardaki Destânî Öncüsü* (Ankara, 2002).

112 A. Y. Ocak, *İslâm-Türk İnançlarında Hızır Yahut Hızır-İlyas Kültü* (İstanbul, 2006).

Exaggerated theses, beginning with Gibbons and continuing partly with Hasluck, and later Speros Vryonis Jr, have made clear the significance of the subject. In response to these, modern Turkish historiography, which has finally begun to be interested in this area, has not, if one puts to one side certain new research, gone beyond the realms of conservative reaction. There is, therefore, a serious need for research into the influences and results, both in history and today, of the cultural intermixing between Muslims and non-Muslims who have lived side by side in Anatolia since the last quarter of the eleventh century.

One characteristic of the new shared life about which we have spoken above was the political, and gradually increasing demographic, superiority of one side over the other. The political superiority and control of the conquerors gradually forced this shared life to emerge. Over time social order returned. The 'soft' approach of the new political hegemony began to attract the attention of the local population to the political and economic advantages which this hegemony ensured for the non-Muslims, even if they found themselves with the status of second-class citizen, described traditionally and legally as *ahl al-dhimma*. It was thus natural that over time a process of conversion to Islam began from the bottom upwards. In some quarters this process was not slow to start. Was there also an opposite process, a process of apostasy? Although it is impossible to know, it is nevertheless possible, however small the numbers involved may have been. In fact, in neither the Turkish nor the Christian sources of the period does one find incidents of apostasy from Islam to the extent that one does of conversion from Christianity to Islam. This is not surprising, for in every place in the world conversions in history are mostly from the bottom upwards, that is, into the religion of those who hold political power and the dominant culture. In this context, the same sociological process must have been at work in Anatolia, too. From the time of the Anatolian Seljuks onwards, we see, in every period, the impact of various social, economic, psychological and religious influences in Anatolian towns, and non-Muslims who had become Muslims. These events even appear in the anonymous epic romances of the period, such as the *Battalname*, *Danişmendname* and *Saltıkname*. However, if one excludes the Ottoman period, we do not have a great deal of reliable historical data related to conversions in the earlier periods, apart from a limited number of short records. But for the Ottoman period, from the fifteenth century, we find many historical examples in the archival documents, particularly in the *mühimme* registers or the Shari'a court orders known as the *kadı sicilleri*. Thanks to these records we can learn the names of the converts in the Ottoman period, their numbers, the social groups they came from, their

family structure, what they did before conversion and after, and various other details.¹¹³

There were without doubt many different reasons for these apparent conversions which occurred in medieval Turkey. A wide variety of factors can be listed from ensuring political and economic influence, and increasing social status – sometimes accomplished through marriage – to conversion with true religious aims. At least in the centuries in which this process began, there are no surviving historical records – with the exception of the *devşirme* in the Ottoman period – of non-Muslims being made Muslim either by the state or by force. To the tolerance shown by the state and the economic benefits assured to converts as factors which encouraged and eased conversion, it is perhaps necessary to add the Byzantine inability now to provide either political or economic benefits or protection to the non-Muslim population, for Byzantium, in contrast to the Turks, was in constant retreat. In other words, the fact that the political power of Christianity in Anatolia had at last been broken was a further factor in conversion.

It is striking that conversions occurred through Sufi circles, as is generally the case today. There is a fairly rich hagiography on this subject. The information in the saintly *menakibnames* (narratives of heroic deeds) gives interesting data and accounts which can be checked against historical events. Thanks to these we can see fairly clearly the conversions which occurred in the urban and rural milies. For example, the *Manakib al-Arifin* and *Vilayetname-i Hacı Bektaş* are two valuable sources from the point of view of understanding and proving conversion which occurred in the circles of Mevlana and Hacı Bektaş.¹¹⁴

Coming to the number of conversions, we do not see in any source of the period under consideration any discussion of mass conversions. In these sources there are only isolated events which involved those who were members of the high strata of society, close to the government. These sources, which were written from the centre of the state, either remained ignorant of conversions which occurred among the people in places far from the centre or gave no importance to them, and for this reason they were not recorded. We should not, therefore, regard conversion as unimportant simply because it

113 For an example of these see B. and L. Bennassar, *Les Chrétiens d'Allah: l'histoire extraordinaire des renégats (XVIe et XVIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1989); O. Çetin, *Sicillere Göre Bursa'da İhtidâ Hareketleri ve Sosyal Sonuçları (1472–1909)* (Ankara, 1994); K. Çolak, 'XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul'da İhtidâ Hareketleri', unpublished PhD thesis, History Department, Hacettepe University, 2000.

114 For this and similar hagiographic literature in Anatolia see Ocak, 'Bazı Menâkıbnâmelere', pp. 31–42.

does not appear in the existing sources. At the same time, however, we should not over-exaggerate it either.

Another highly significant event for the social and ethnic history of medieval Turkey in this regard is the conversion of the Mongols who, taking control of the Anatolian Seljuk state, aimed at ending the Muslim hegemony in the Middle East touched on earlier. The historical importance of this conversion stems from their becoming a part of the Islamic world which they planned to conquer and wipe from the map.

Theological encounters and debates

The existence of Islam and Christianity side by side as the religions of the majority in Turkey in this period opened the way to another dimension of cultural exchange. This was related to the theological encounters and debates between the representatives of the two faiths. The first historical records on this subject are found in the Turkish epic romances such as *Ebümüslimname*, *Battalname*, *Danişmendname* and *Saltıkname*, which we have mentioned above. These sources are important as they show, although they are not historical texts, that these theological debates began very early in Anatolia and in a very striking manner.

Such a development in the period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries should be regarded as a natural process. We know of the existence of a type of theological discussion between various Sufis and monks and priests in the Seljuk period, partly from historical texts, partly from the epic romances referred to above. For example, we know that the young Seljuk sultan İzzeddin Keykavus II (1246–8), who was related to the Byzantine royal house through his mother, held theological debates between priests and experts in Islamic canon law.¹¹⁵ It is well known that Mevlana frequently visited a monastery called *Ak Manastır* or *Deyr-i Eflatun* near Konya and held theological debates, that among those who joined these discussions were various people from the Christian and Jewish communities, and that from time to time various monks even came from Constantinople to see him.¹¹⁶ According to one anecdote Mevlana advised a Muslim merchant who had insulted a Christian colleague to go immediately and apologise and obtain his blessing. We learn from the *Velayetname-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli* that Hacı Bektaş-i Veli had relations with the monks and Christian population of Ürgüp and the surrounding region.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ See Eflaki, *Manâkib al-'Arifin*, II, pp. 123–5.

¹¹⁶ Eflaki, *Manâkib al-'Arifin*, *passim*.

¹¹⁷ *Vilâyetnâme, Manakıb-ı Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli*, ed. A. Gölpınarlı (Istanbul, 1958), pp. 23–4.

In the early Ottoman period Orhan Gazi is said to have organised heated theological debates in his presence and to have joined in personally.¹¹⁸ It is very well known that Börklüce Mustafa, who was close to Şeyh Bedreddin, conducted theological debates with the monks on Chios in the fifteenth century.¹¹⁹ Another well-known example is that of Sultan Mehmed II who, after taking Constantinople, had similar debates with Gennadios (Scholarios). Removing Gennadios from prison, Mehmed appointed him to the position of patriarch, and even wanted him to write a text on Christian theology. Latin writers and Byzantine intellectuals, in particular Georgios Trapezuntios and Georgios Amirutzes, presented similar texts to the Ottoman sultan.¹²⁰

Intellectual life

The intellectual life of Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, various aspects of which – knowledge, thought, literature and, partly, Sufism – will be discussed here in general terms, constitutes an important aspect of the history of Turkey. This new intellectual world was created by the arrival in a region, with its own political, social and ethnic structure, of a different society which came in from outside and constructed its own culture with its own beliefs, language and literature in its new homeland. Even if the result was an intellectual and cultural unit developed by those forced into the region from outside, and even if in the end it was Muslim, the process must also have involved the contribution of those from different cultures and regions. Above all, this intellectual and cultural accumulation created its own language anew in the new lands. The language which appeared here would become a new tongue, which we can call the Turkish of Turkey, developing along different lines from the language spoken and written in Central Asia. Partly influenced by Arabic and Persian, it passed through various stages and underwent various transformations to attain the form it has today.

118 See, for example, Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 421, 426; M. Balivet, 'Byzantins judaïsants et juifs islamisés', *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 24–41.

119 M. Balivet, 'Derviches Turcs en Roumanie Latin: quelques remarques sur la circulation des idées religieuses au XVe siècle', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 11 (1987), 239–55. Using the archives of Thessalonike, Venice and the Vatican, Michel Balivet has recently intensified his research on this theological polemic in medieval and modern Anatolia and devoted his work to this subject, *Romanie Byzantine et Pays de Rum: histoire d'un espace d'imbrication Gréco-Turque* (Istanbul, 1994); M. Balivet, *Les Turcs au moyen-âge: des croisades aux Ottomans* (Istanbul, 2002).

120 For these texts and an analysis see M. Balivet, *Pour une concorde Îslâmo-Chrétien: démarches Byzantine et Latines à la fin du moyen-âge* (Rome, 1997).

*The method of expression of intellectual life in medieval
Anatolia: the language (Arabic, Persian and Turkish)*

Although Ibn Bibi writes that there were five languages spoken in thirteenth-century Anatolia (Turkish, Greek, Armenian, Arabic and Persian), he does not say anything about their geographical spread.¹²¹ This is an important indication that the ethnic and social structure of thirteenth-century Anatolia was not yet uniform. There is no record either about the written languages. We know from the works produced in Anatolia which have come down to us that in scholarly and Sufi circles Arabic and, partly, Persian were used. We know, too, that diplomatic documents were written in Arabic and Persian.¹²² While W. Barthold says that the official language of the state among the Anatolian Seljuks down to the thirteenth century was Arabic,¹²³ the contemporary historian Karim al-Din Aqsara'i records that it passed from Arabic to Persian in the palace at the time of Sahib Fahreddin Ali in the same century.¹²⁴ It has long been accepted that the spoken language in the Seljuk court was Persian, but this has not been conclusively proved. Although Turkish was probably widespread among the Artukids, Mengücekids and Saltukids who ruled in Anatolia at the same time as the Anatolian Seljuks, we do not have any works in Turkish from these states which have survived to today. It is to be presumed that among them, as with the Seljuks, the intellectual circles probably used Persian and Arabic, at least officially. However, it is extremely likely that in the courts of both the Anatolian Seljuks, the Saltukids, Mengücekids and Artukids and in those of the western Anatolian beyliks, official documents were written in different languages according to the period and conditions, and the state to which they were addressed.

It is possible to guess that there were many works written in Persian in Anatolia in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.¹²⁵ The number of Persian works known today is probably very small in comparison with the number actually written. However, it would be incorrect to explain the fact that works

121 Ibn Bibi, *El Evamirü'l-Ala'iyye fi'l-Umüri'l-Ala'iyye* (Tıpkıbasım), ed. A. Sadık Erzi (Ankara, 1956), p. 77; *El Evamirü'l-Ala'iyye fi'l-Umuri'l-Ala'iyye* (Selçuk Name), tr. Mürsel Öztürk, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1996), I, pp. 97, 141.

122 For one such document which has survived from the last period of the Anatolian Seljuks and was written by a *münşi* (scribe) see Abu Bakr İbn al-Zaki, *Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadikat al-Albâb*, ed. Ali Sevim (Ankara, 1972).

123 W. Barthold, *Orta Asya Türk Tarihi Hakkında Dersler* (Istanbul, 1927), p. 119; Köprülü also states this, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, p. 334.

124 Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, *Müsâmeret*, p. 64.

125 For detailed information see A. Karaismailoğlu, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Farsça ve Farsça Eserler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 487–92.

were written in Persian and Arabic only by a tie to or admiration felt among Turkish intellectuals for these two dominant languages of Islamic culture of the time, for we well know that the Seljuk sultans and the rulers of Karaman, Germiyan, the Candaroğulları and other Anatolian beyliks strove to attract scholars and men of art and literature to their lands and that these scholars wrote works in their own languages in this competitive environment which was thus created.¹²⁶

There is no doubt that the semi-settled groups and the village and urban populations spoke Turkish and that those who came and settled in Anatolia brought with them Turkish oral traditions, legends and poetry, even though these may not have been written down until later. Other, literate people who knew the literary language of Central Asia also came into Anatolia and must have learnt the Turkish which was beginning to develop there, for had they not it would be difficult to explain the original works of literature, Sufism and learning written in Turkish, or translated into Turkish from Persian and Arabic in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹²⁷

In the Anatolian Seljuk period, the use of Persian as the literary written language and the language of diplomacy in official and intellectual circles, and of Arabic for scientific knowledge and learning severely restricted the area dominated by Turkish. For this reason the number of works written in Turkish is small. We can guess, too, but without clear proof, that another reason for this paucity is the destruction caused by the Mongol invasion. Nevertheless, in the fourteenth century Yunus Emre (d. 1320), Aşık Paşa (d. 1332), Elvan Çelebi (d. after 1358) and other Turkoman şeyhs and dervishes turned to writing their Sufi thoughts and ideas in Turkish which was the language of the groups they were addressing.¹²⁸ Turkish, thus, was able to produce its own writers and poets who from the thirteenth century wrote works

126 Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, pp. 208–9, 243–5; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri* (Ankara, 1988; repr. 2003). For works written in Persian in Anatolia in this period see A. Ateş, 'Hicri VI–VIII. (XII–IV.) Asırlarda Anadolu'da Farsça Eserler', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 7–8, 2 (1948), 94–135; Köprülü, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları I'; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, 'XII. ve XIII. Asırda Anadolu'daki Fikir Hareketleri ile İçtimai Müesseselere Bir Bakış', III. *Türk Tarih Kongresi Tebliğleri* (Ankara, 1948), pp. 287–306.

127 For the question of how Turkish was established and developed in Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries see Muhsin Macit, 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Türkçe ve Gelişimi', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 481–6.

128 Aşık Paşa was one of the foremost defenders of the use of Turkish in Anatolia as shown in his very famous verses: 'Kamu dilde var-ıdı zabt u usul/Bunlara düşmüş-idi cümle ukul/Türk diline kimsene bakmaz ıdı/Türklere hergiz gönül akmaz-ıdı/Türk dakı bilmez idi ol dilleri/Ol ince yolu ulu menzilleri.' (In all languages there were regulations and method/All intellectuals were caught up with them [i.e. Arabic and Persian]/ Nobody considered the Turkish language/Nobody's heart flows out to the

in Anatolian Turkish, which we can call western Oğuz Turkish. In particular, the dervishes of Ahmed-i Yesevi and Kutbeddin Haydar who came into Anatolia initiated among their followers the writing of poetry in the Turkish which they spoke. It is therefore hardly contentious to suggest that the greatest contribution to the development of Turkish occurred in this environment, and western Oğuz Turkish, however much of a problem there is with the extant written corpus, made its most important advance with the great Sufi poet Yunus Emre. Apart from Yunus Emre, Hoca Dehhani, Şeyyad Hamza and Ahmed Fakih, who were recognised for the first time by Fuad Köprülü as poets writing in Turkey in the thirteenth century but who are now known to have lived in the fourteenth century, can be accepted without dispute as among the first poets who used Anatolian Turkish as a written language.¹²⁹

Turkish, thus, first through the poems of these poets and then the translations from Arabic and Persian made in literary, scholarly and religious circles in the regions under the control of the various beyliks such as Karaman, Aydın, Menteşe and Germiyan and finally the Ottomans, and the simple works written especially in Sufi circles for the common people, began gradually to take over in Anatolia in the Seljuk and beylik periods in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. The complete domination of Turkish which occurred during the fourteenth century was brought to fruition by the poems, literature, Sufi compositions and translations which will be discussed below. Furthermore, we should not forget the part played by the Turkoman *beys*, the majority of whom knew no language other than Turkish, who, thanks to their use of this language for their diplomatic documents, contributed to making Turkish into the excellent and refined diplomatic language that, gradually elaborated from the end of the fifteenth century, it was to become under the Ottomans.¹³⁰

The tradition that the first active political initiative to replace Persian with Turkish in the diplomatic arena was taken by Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey after his capture of Konya in 1276 is generally accepted. According to this tradition, Mehmet Bey ordered that Turkish should now be written and spoken

Turks/Even the Turk did not know those tongues/Those narrow paths, those great destinations.)

129 The first person to recognise the scholarly world of these poets was Fuad Köprülü. After Köprülü, further research was conducted and new examples of their poems found and published. For this subject see A. Kartal, 'Anadolu'da Farsça Şiir Söyleyen Türk Şâirleri', in *Türkler*, ed. H. C. Güzel, K. Çiçek and S. Koca (Ankara, 2002), vol. VII, pp. 680–93; A. Kartal, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Şiir ve Şâirler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 493–520.

130 See, for example, Irene Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I* (Munich, 1967).

everywhere, both in the court and in literature.¹³¹ While it is debatable whether his initiative sprang from practical motivation as the result of his not knowing a language other than Turkish, or whether it was based on the conscious choice of one language, there is no doubt that Turkish becoming the official language in use in all the Anatolian beyliks was historically significant, especially from the point of view of the political and cultural future of Turkey.

One of the factors which accelerated the process of Turkish becoming dominant as an official language and a language of literature in Anatolia was the translation activity which was continuous from the Anatolian beylik period onwards. The fact that the *beys* and the populace did not know Arabic and Persian was without doubt influential in the production of translations of works related to religion, culture and literature which attracted their interest. With the collapse of the Anatolian Seljuk state, Persian lost its former position as a written language from the fourteenth century and the literate circles turned their attention to compositions or translations of works which fitted the expectations of the rulers and the people. The translation activity gradually increased to cover a very wide spectrum from, in particular, religious and Sufi books of a popular nature to medical texts, from rhymed and prose literary works to encyclopaedic essays.

Translations began to appear of religious Sufi classics such as the thirteenth-century great Iranian Sufi Farid al-din Attar's (d. 1299) *Manteq al-Tayr*, *Tadhkirat al-Awliya* and Abu Ishak al-Tha'labi's (d. 1035) *Qisas al-Ambiya*. These translations prepared the ground for the development of a Turkish which, in the fourteenth century, allowed the creation of popular Sufi works and especially of a rich prose/rhymed *menakıbnâme* literature. Anonymous folk stories and epic romances such as *Ebumüslimname*, *Hamzaname* and *Battalname* were also translated in this period from Persian and Arabic. In the fifteenth century, under the Ottoman ruler Murad II, the chronicle of Ibn Bibi was translated by Yazıcızade Ali into Turkish with some important additions.¹³²

131 See Ibn Bibi, *ElEvamirü'l-Ala'iyye*, p. 696: 'Hic kes ba'd el-yevm der divan u dergah u bargah u meclis u meydan cuz be-zaban-i turki suhan ne-guyed'; *Selçuk Name*, II, p. 209: 'Bugünden itibaren divanda, dergahta, bargahta, meclisde ve meydanda Türkçe'den başka dil kullanılmayacaktır' (From today no other language than Turkish will be used in the council, in the dervish lodge, in the court, in the assembly and in the square). This day is still celebrated in Turkey today as Dil Bayramı (Language Day).

132 See *Tevarih-i Al-i Selçuk*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi (Revan) Kütüphanesi, nos. 1390-1392, 3 vols. Let us recall here that behind the translation of this work was the Ottoman administration's establishment of a political construct as proof that they came from the Kayı branch of the Oğuz in order to oppose the challenge of the Karakoyunlu. A large number of works either translated into Turkish or written in Turkish in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been produced over the years as scholarly editions by

The encouragement of the sultans and the *beys* played an important role in translation activity, and they paid a great deal of money for these translations. We have today a fairly clear idea about which *beys* and sultans the small number of surviving works were dedicated to, even if there is dispute in some cases.

What we can say, however, is that scholars and poets, Sufis and mystics who wrote their works under the protection of the Germiyanogulları, Karamanogulları and Aydinogulları in particular were in the vanguard of the development of Turkish as a written language. Germiyan was particularly important for the extensive use of Turkish in works composed in the areas of literature, Sufism and learned knowledge and in this context the reigns of Yakub Bey, his son Mehmed Bey (d. 1363) and Süleymanşah were productive. Süleymanşah gave support and protection to scholars and poets of the era such as Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, Ahmed-i Dai, Ahmedi and Şeyhi who will be briefly discussed below. After the Ottoman conquest, almost all of these men moved under Ottoman protection. Similar developments occurred one after the other in the other beyliks and, with the total removal of Persian from the literary sphere and Arabic from scientific and Sufi spheres, the dominant position finally passed to Turkish.

The world of education, teaching, knowledge and thought

We must note here at the outset that in the transformation of Christian Byzantine Anatolia into Muslim Turkey the role of Sufism, Sufis and Sufi institutions was just as great as that of the political leaders.¹³³ But in the period of the establishment and development of the Turkish states of which the most developed example was the Ottoman Empire, the greatest share in the creation and working of the administrative, social and cultural institutions was first and foremost without doubt that of the scholarly institutions, that is, the *medreses*. This is an extremely important point and one that we need to stress and to understand clearly.

The *medreses* in Turkey of the twelfth to fifteenth centuries were here, as they had been in the entire Islamic world since approximately the eleventh

the Türk Dil Kurumu, which continues to publish these works. Furthermore, many doctoral theses have been written, and continue to be written, on such early works in the literature departments of Turkish universities.

¹³³ On this subject see in particular G. Leiser, 'The Madrasah and the Islamization of Anatolia before the Ottomans', in *Law and Education in Medieval Islam: Studies in Memory of Professor George Makdisi*, ed. Joseph E. Lowry, Devin J. Stewart and Shawkat M. Toorawa (London, 2004), pp. 176–82.

century, the main centres of the state's official education, teaching and scholarly life.¹³⁴ The research that will result in a full and sound understanding of both the organisation and functioning of the *medreses*, which gave education and teaching in the various branches of knowledge of the period under discussion – of their scholarly education, teaching and scholarly life, of the scholars employed there, with their scientific and scholarly activities, and the works they wrote – is still only at an initial stage today. We can gather limited information partly from biographies and chronicles written in Anatolia and neighbouring Muslim countries in the period, partly from *vakıf* registers and *vakıf* deeds which have come down to us, even if as later copies, and partly from works written by local or foreign *ulema* employed in the *medreses* of the period. Modern research on this subject can provide an outline within the framework of this material, even if it is for the moment only a general picture.¹³⁵

Drawing on data that we have obtained from the structures which have survived, archaeological digs and *vakıf* records, as well as on the research of art historians, we can glean information about many *medreses* the names of which we will not list here but which were active in various religious and scientific spheres in Anatolia in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, and about the *ulema* who lived in them.¹³⁶ We know that, as was usual for the teaching in the *medreses* in accordance with the traditional classification of medieval Islam, knowledge was studied in two major categories, scientific (*akli ilimler*) and religious (*nakli ilimler*). It is known that scientific studies included geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, logic, philosophy and medicine; and religious studies was composed of subjects such as interpretation (*tefsir*), prophetic tradition (*hadith*), theology (*kalam*), religious law (*fıkıh*) and Sufism. Although there was a preference that the books which were read, particularly on religious subjects, in the *medreses* and the teachers who taught them should be exclusively from the Hanefi *mezhep*, because the Anatolian Seljuks and

134 See F. Unan, 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Eğitim', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 389–400.

135 For example, see Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri*, pp. 228–34; Turan, *Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi*, pp. 34–40, 74–9, 120–3, 219–24; Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, pp. 389–95.

136 Apart from the references given in note 135, see also Halil Edhem, 'Âl-i Germiyan Kitâbeleri', *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası I* (1910), 128; Edhem, *Kayseriyye Şehri* (İstanbul, AH 1334), pp. 98–9; A. Sayılı, 'Vâcidiye Medresesi, Kütahya'da Bir Ortaçağ Türk Rasathanesi', *Belleten* 12, 47 (1948), 655–6; Turan, 'Şemseddin Altun-Aba, Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı', p. 204; İ. H. Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Konya Tarihi* (Konya, 1964), p. 851; N. Göyünç, XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı, p. 114; Ara Altun, *Mardin'de Türk Devri Mimarisi* (İstanbul, 1971), p. 88; M. Sözen, *Anadolu Medreseleri*, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1970–2), I, pp. 75, 145–6, 166, 173.

the rulers of the beyliks were members of this *mezhep*, this was not much enforced.¹³⁷ The official education, teaching policy and the law was, however, in accordance with this *mezhep*. This was a historical choice stemming from the Turks' acceptance of Islam in Central Asia, and was important not only for the political history of Turkey in that period but also for its social and cultural history, as it had significance for the course of Turkish history in the Islamic period in particular, and for the internal history of the Hanefi *mezhep* in general.

The state's being officially Hanefi did not create an obstacle to *ulema* belonging to other Sunni *mezheps* being employed in either the bureaucracy or the *medreses* in Anatolia and we know of many examples of this. Since the *ulema* who came into the region from outside were from different regions and belonged to different branches of learning, it is easy to understand that there was a very cosmopolitan and international intellectual environment of learning and ideas in the important Anatolian towns of the period, in particular in those which were capitals.¹³⁸ The sources give important information about the scholars who came to Anatolia in this period and either gave lessons in the *medreses* or wrote works on various subjects. We can give as examples Hatib el-Kazvini (d. 1338), one of the well-known scholars in the fields of rhetoric, *fıkıh*, the method of *fıkıh* and theology and who was *kadı* in Tokat-Niksar;¹³⁹ Esireddin el-Ebheri (d. 1265), the famous Iranian philosopher, astronomer and mathematician;¹⁴⁰ Kutbeddin Shirazi (d. 1311), another famous Iranian scholar of astronomy, mathematics, medicine and religion who taught in the Gökmedrese in Sivas, was *kadı* in Sivas and Malatya and later moved to Kastamonu where he wrote a work called *Ihtiyarat-ı Muzafferî*, dedicated to Muzaffereddin Yavlak Arslan;¹⁴¹ the famous Hanefi expert in *fıkıh*, *kadı* Ebu Said el-Herevi (d. 1142); and Alaeddin Kaşani (d. 1191), author of a famous work of *fıkıh* called *Badai' al-sanayi*. This last figure came to Konya at the time of the Seljuk sultan

¹³⁷ The *vakfiye* date 598/1202 of the Altunaba Medresesi in Konya imposed the condition that the *müderris* who worked in the *medrese* had to be from the Hanefi *mezhep*. See Turan, 'Şemseddin Altun-Aba, Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı'; Leiser, 'The Madrasah', pp. 176–82.

¹³⁸ This is an area which has still not attracted the attention of Turkish historians. Future detailed research on the various scholarly works on different subjects which were written in Anatolia will therefore advance our knowledge of the subject and shed further light on the intellectual and scholarly life of the period. Research has been, and is being, conducted to compare the Sufi scholarly environment with the scholarly environment in general in this period.

¹³⁹ İsmail Durmuş, 'Hatib Kazvinî', in *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* [hereafter *TDVİA*], xxv, pp. 156–7.

¹⁴⁰ Abdülkuddüs Bingöl, 'Esirüddin Ebherî', *TDVİA*, x, pp. 75–6.

¹⁴¹ Azmi Şerbetçi, 'Kutbüddin-i Şîrâzî', *TDVİA*, xxvi, pp. 487–9.

Mesud I (1116–56) and was sent as ambassador to Nureddin Mahmud b. Zengi.¹⁴² To these we can add, among others, Yusuf b. Said el-Sicistani (d. 639/1241–2), author of works on *fıkıh* entitled *Munyat al-Mufti* and *Ghunyat al-Fuqaha*,¹⁴³ Ali b. Muhammed b. Hibetullah el-Buhari (d. 1169) who lived in Konya,¹⁴⁴ and Muhammed Talakani (d. 1217), a well-known expert on *fıkıh* in his time.¹⁴⁵

Apart from scholars in religious knowledge and learning, we can also list other men active in the fields of science and philosophy who, coming from outside and settling in Anatolia, taught and wrote there. A good example of such scholars is ‘Abdüllatif el-Bağdadi (d. 1231) who was a highly talented Islamic scholar and philosopher. We know that he wrote two famous books, *al-Hikmat al-'Ala'iyya* and *Bulgat al-Hikma*, in Erzincan.¹⁴⁶ We must also mention here another of these scholars who came into Anatolia, Ebu Abdullah Efdaleddin el-Huneci (d. 1248) who was a member of the Fahr al-din al-Razi school and who, as well as being an expert on Shafi'i *fıkıh*, was a judge and a scholar of logic,¹⁴⁷ and one of his students, the famous Siraceddin el-Urmevi (d. 1283). Siraceddin el-Urmevi, too, just like his master el-Huneci, was a scholar of theology and *fıkıh*, was a *kadı* in Konya, and was also at the same time an important philosopher and logician. His work entitled *Matali' al-Anwar* on logic was for a long time read as a textbook in the Ottoman *medreses*.¹⁴⁸ As a final example we must note in particular Nasir al-din Tusi (d. 1274), one of the famous scholars who was for a time *kadı* in Malatya. It is known that he made various innovations to the theorem of Pythagoras and that he researched into trigonometry.¹⁴⁹

These men were by no means the only scholars of the time, and the life of teaching, education and learning in medieval Turkey was much more extensive than our brief survey might indicate. With new research we shall probably learn more and be better able to assess the contributions of the intellectual life of this period to religious knowledge, science and philosophy in the classic Islamic Middle Ages.

142 K Ferhat Koca, 'Kâşânî', *TDVİA*, xxiv, p. 531.

143 Murteza Bedir, 'Osmanlı Öncesi Türk Hukuk Tarihi Yazıcılığı', *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 3, 5 (2005), 82.

144 R. Şeşen, 'Selçuklular Devrindeki İlme Genel Bir Bakış', in *III. Uluslararası Mevlâna Kongresi 5–6 Mayıs 2003, Bildiriler* (Konya, 2004), pp. 233–44.

145 A. Y. Ocak, 'Anadolu', *TDVİA*, iii, p. 111. 146 Şeşen, 'Selçuklular', p. 242.

147 Mustafa Çağırıcı, 'Hüneci', *TDVİA*, xviii, p. 375.

148 See Şeşen, 'Selçuklular', p. 243.

149 For details see E. Kahya, 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Bilim', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I*, ed. Ocak, p. 404.

Literary activity

Writers, poetry and poets in medieval Turkey

The poetic arts of Turkey in the thirteenth to fifteen centuries, as was the case in the Islamic world in general in that period, were strongly supported by the spiritual and material encouragement of the sultans and high-level men of state. There is no doubt that their encouragement played a major role in the development of this type of universal literature in the artistic and intellectual life in their own regions. But to say that this encouragement was given only with the aim of developing poetry would be to see only one side of the question. The fundamental motivation of such encouragement was to ensure that the qualities of these leaders – such as heroism, justice and bravery, epithets which the leaders wished to hear applied to themselves – were praised, and thus to maintain and increase their prestige in public opinion, to ensure that their names were not forgotten and to leave their mark among the people, both while they were alive and after their deaths. This, however, was by no means the end of the matter. They appreciated beautifully written poems which appealed to aesthetic and artistic feelings, took pleasure in rewarding such poems and encouraged poets. In this context we have many examples of considerable material and financial gifts and donations made to famous poets, and to some of these poets being appointed to important offices.

This tradition continued among the Anatolian Seljuk sultans and the Turkoman *beys*. Ibn Bibi explained why the Seljuk sultans rewarded poets whom they liked, quoting the words of Fahreddin Behramşah from the house of Mengücek and son-in-law of Sultan Rükneddin Süleymanşah: ‘If a poem is successful, I shall donate treasuries and treasures, because with this rhymed work my name shall remain immortal in this transitory world. To remain unforgotten in this transitory world and temporary realm and for a name to be remembered forever is a very great honour and to attain it is a difficult achievement.’¹⁵⁰

It was this mentality which led İzzeddin Keykavus I to bestow on Sahib Şemseddin Muhammed-i İsfahani the office both of *eşraf-i matbah* (the head of the palace kitchen) and of *inşa-yı has* (his private secretary) upon receiving from him a quatrain which he very much liked.¹⁵¹ As well as such titles, ranks and positions, the sultans and *beys* also granted highly esteemed honorary titles which had long been known in Islamic countries, such as *malik al-shu’ara*, on poets whom they liked and admired. Among literary men who were officially

150 Ibn Bibi, *El Evamirü'l-Ala'iyye*, p. 72, *Selçuk Name*, I, p. 92.

151 Ibn Bibi, *El Evamirü'l-Ala'iyye*, p. 202–3, *Selçuk Name*, I, p. 221.

appointed to this rank were prominent poets of their times such as Abu al-Fada'il Muhi al-din, Nizameddin Ahmed-i Erzincani and Bahaeddin Kani'i.

Seljuk sultans did not restrict themselves to encouraging poets, but were also from time to time successful poets themselves, as were, for example, Rükneddin Süleymanşah (1196–1204), Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I (1192–6, 1204–10), İzzeddin Keykavus I (1210–20) and Alaeddin Keykubad I (1220–37). The sultans were not alone in this for there were good poets also among the statesmen, such as Muhammed b. Gazi-i Malatyavi, the *vezir* of Rükneddin Süleymanşah; Nizameddin Ahmed-i Erzincani and Mecdeddin Ebubekr, scribes of the period of İzzeddin Keykavus I and Alaeddin Keykubad I; the *vezir* of İzzeddin Keykavus II, Şemseddin Muhammed İsfahani; Nizameddin Hurşid, the Pervane of Greek origin of Sultan İzzeddin Keykavus II; and Emir Kemaleddin Kamyar.

Some poems written in the Anatolian Seljuk period in Persian, Arabic and Turkish in the style of *mesnevi* (poems in rhymed couplets), *kaside* and *rubai* (quatrain), an important number of them on Sufi subjects, have come down to us today.¹⁵² The best known among the Persian *mesnevis* is without doubt the six-volume *Mesnevi-i Ma'nevi* (*Masnavi-i Ma'navi*) of Mevlana. Read at the time, in later centuries and in our own day with great admiration and esteem, and by the Mevlevi themselves today with a feeling of great reverence, it was a work about which very many commentaries were written. We must also not forget his *Divan-ı Kebir* (*Divan-i Kabir*) which was created from *gazels* (lyric poems) and quatrains (*rubai*) which were uttered extemporaneously during the *sema* (the whirling dance during the Mevlevi ceremony). Among this type important examples are the *İbtidaname* of Mevlana's son Sultan Veled, the oldest source for his father's life and for Mevlevi beliefs, the *Rebabname* and the *İntihaname* in which certain characteristics of the *tarikât* were discussed. We must also include Sultan Veled's Persian *Divan* (Collection) which was made up of various forms of poetry, such as *kaside*, *gazel*, *kıt'a*, *terci-i bend*, *terkib-i bend*, *musammat* and *rubai*.

Later in the fourteenth century in the time of the beyliks the most famous Persian *mesnevis* which were written in Anatolia were the *Anis al-Kulub* of Kadı Burhaneddin, which was a work of religio-moral character composed of seven sections and which is counted as one of the oldest local sources of Anatolian Seljuk history, the *Munis al-Awarif* of Naseddin-i Sicistani, and the *Uşşakname* of the great Iranian Sufi poet Fahreddin-i Iraki.

Turning to the poets who composed in Turkish and to their poetry, it is known that Mevlana and his son Sultan Veled also wrote poems in this

152 For detailed information, see the citations in note 129.

language. But we must stress that Yunus Emre, who is thought to have lived from the middle of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the fourteenth, and who wrote a Turkish *Divan* and a *mesnevi* called *Risaletü'n-Nushiyye*, has an exceptional place among the poets who wrote in Turkish in this period. His importance lies in his works which explained his beliefs – although they were not original from the point of view of Sufi thought – and his artistic use of Turkish. Yunus Emre played an important role in the establishment of Anatolian Turkish of the period as an independent written language and he even created a Sufi Turkish terminology.

Another poet whose Turkish poems written in this period attract our attention is Dehhani. Some of his poems are found in the important collections of *nazire* (imitative poetry) such as the *Mecmu'at el-Neza'ir* of Ömer b. Mezid in the fifteenth century, the *Cami' el-Neza'ir* of Eğridirli Hacı Kemaleddin in the sixteenth, and the *Kenz el-Kübera* of Şeyhoğlu Mustafa. Fuad Köprülü regards Dehhani as representing the beginning of secular classical Turkish poetry in Anatolia. In contrast to the leanings of almost all the poets of the period towards religious-Sufi subjects, the poems of Dehhani, to judge from the few examples we have in our hands, almost in their entirety resonate with a worldliness and a lively style almost in the manner of Omar Khayyam. Although we know from the *Karamanoğulları Şahnamesi* of Yarıcani, one of the poets of fourteenth-century Anatolia, that Dehhani wrote a Persian Seljuk *şehname* of 20,000 couplets in the style of Firdowsi's *Shahname* on the order of Sultan Alaeddin Keykubad I, this work has not come down to us. Other poets who should be mentioned as the last of the poets of the Seljuk period are Kemaleddin Hubeş b. İbrahim Tiflisi, and Nasiri, son of Rükneddin el-Urmevi, dervishes of Sultan Veled.

According to the information we have today the earliest recorded poet of the fourteenth century was Gülşehri. Gülşehri, a Sufi poet who lived at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth, is known for having made various changes to the famous *mesnevi*, *Mantiq al-Tayr* of Farid al-din 'Attar, and to have translated it into Turkish under the same title. From his works it is very clear that he remained under the influence of the classical Iranian poets such as Sa'di-i Shirazi, Farid ed-din 'Attar, Hakim Senayi and Nizami-i Genjevi, and in particular Mevlana. He wrote his poetic works with the aim of proving that more beautiful works could be written in Turkish than in Persian. Another Turkish work, again in the style of a *mesnevi*, is the little treatise called *Keramat-i Ahi Evren* which gave an account of Turkish miracles of the famous Ahi Evren and the rules of *ahilik*. Apart from this, there are also some poems in the form of *kaside*, *gazel* or single couplets.

One of the fundamentally important poets of the period who was briefly mentioned above was Aşık Ali Paşa. Aşık Paşa, who was the grandson of Baba İlyas-i Horasani, apart from the famous *Garibname*, was the author of a Sufi *mesnevi* called *Fakrname* and other smaller volumes of *mesnevis*. Other important poets of the period whom we must mention were Şeyyad Hamza, who was most probably an unconventional type of dervish who composed Sufi poems written both in the *aruz* metre and in the syllabic metre, and works called *Yusuf u Zeliha*, *Dasitan-i Sultan Mahmud* and *Ahval-i Kıyamet*; Ahmed Fakih, whose works *Çarhname* and *Kitabu Evsaf-ı Mesacidi'ş-Şerife* have survived to today; and Mesud b. Ahmed (Hoca Mesud), who was most probably from Germiyan and has a *mesnevi* called *Süheyl ü Nev-Bahar* written in a meticulous and lively Turkish.

Ahmedi, another of this period's most important poets, received a good theological education in Egypt, then returned to Anatolia where he first joined Ayas Bey from the Aydınoğulları and later became a teacher and adviser to Germiyanoglu Süleymanşah. He then entered the service first of the Ottoman sultan Yıldırım Bayezid, then of his son Emir Süleyman and finally of Çelebi Mehmed. He died in Amasya. Ahmedi, who wrote his works in fourteenth–fifteenth-century Anatolia, is best known for his *İskendername*. The *Mevlid* and *Dasitan-i Tevarih-i Müluk-i Al-i Osman* sections in this work are important, first because they are the earliest Turkish examples of this type of work before the composition of the famous Süleyman Çelebi, and second, because they are the harbinger of the Ottoman history-writing tradition. Ahmedi also wrote another *Divan*, and he rewrote under the same title and with some changes the *mesnevi* called *Cemşid ü Hurşid* of the Iranian poet Salman Savaji, which took as its subject one of his classic love stories. Apart from these works in Turkish, Ahmedi wrote other works in Persian. It is accepted that with his verse works, written on various subjects, Ahmedi made a considerable contribution both to the development of Turkish and to the establishment of classical Turkish literature.

Another significant poet was Ahmed-i Dai, from Germiyan, who lived from the end of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the fifteenth and wrote important works in Turkish. Ahmed-i Dai, a thorough master of Turkish and of literary arts, or more correctly poetry, lived through the successive reigns of the Germiyan Yakub Bey II, and the Ottoman sultans Murad I, Emir Süleyman, Mehmed I and Murad II, and dedicated his work to these sultans. Although his contribution to the creation of classical Anatolian Turkish literature was considerable, from the point of view of his literary power, fame and later influence, he lagged behind his contemporary Ahmedi.

Ahmed-i Dai, a highly cultured poet, was the author of as many as fifteen works on various subjects. Of these, two copies of his Turkish *Divan* are extant. His Persian *Divan* dated 1413 was dedicated to the *vezir* Hacı Halil Paşa on the occasion of Çelebi Mehmed's ascending the throne. His *Çengname*, which he is said to have written under the inspiration of Emir Süleyman's drinking gatherings and in which Sufi motifs appear from time to time, is one of the first examples composed on this subject. The work was created in twenty-four sections suitable for a single-stringed eastern musical instrument called *çeng* and for the twenty-four *makams* (modes) of eastern music. Another of his works, the *Camasbname*, is an extended translation of the thirty-three-couplet *mesnevi* of Nasir al-din Tusi (d. 1274) of the same title in the style of *Yıldızname* (astrological book for predicting the future) which discusses the occult.

A further important poet of the era was the famous scholar, poet, man of letters and statesman Kadı Burhaneddin (one of whose works in Persian, the *Anis al-Kulub*, was discussed above). A Harezm Turk, he was the ruler of a state named after him which he founded after the collapse of the Eretna state in Sivas in the second half of the fourteenth century. The famous Turkish *Divan* of Kadı Burhaneddin,¹⁵³ one of the most important and typical of the poets of Anatolian classical Turkish poetry, shows a natural refinement, despite the author having passed his life in political struggle. Only a single copy of this *Divan* has survived.

Şeyhi, whose real name was Yusuf Sinan, was another major poet of the period. A doctor as well as a poet, Şeyhi, who was raised in the fifteenth century in the region of Germiyan, was said to have taken his pseudonym because of his adherence to Hacı Bayram-ı Veli. At first in the service of Germiyanoglu Yakub Bey II, he then entered the service of Çelebi Mehmed when Germiyan passed under the control of the Ottoman beylik, and then went on to serve Murad II. His importance as a poet was such that he received the title *Şeyh el-şu'ara* (*şeyh* of the poets). He was the author of the second *Hüsrev ü Şirin* story written in Anatolia. His famous *Harname*, written in clear Turkish, is an example of an elegant and subtle social satire. *Harname*'s subtle witty humour and satire placed it at the forefront of Turkish humour and satirical literature. Şeyhi was one of the major figures who contributed to the development of classical Anatolian Turkish literature, and his Turkish *Divan* can be counted among the fundamental works of Turkish literature.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ This *Divan* can be found in the British Library, OR. 4126.

¹⁵⁴ For more detailed information on the poets and poetry of the Seljuk and beylik periods, see Kartal, 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Şiir ve Şâirler', pp. 493–520.

Prose

From the names which appear in the sources and from what has survived, we can say that the works produced in prose in Turkish in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries were nearly all treatises and books written on scientific subjects. These were generally either compositions in Persian or Arabic or translated from Arabic to Persian. Almost all of the writers, as noted above, were *ulema* who came into Anatolia from outside. According to Ateş, the majority of works written in Anatolia in the period to the reign of Alaeddin Keykubad I were books and treatises relating to philosophy and natural sciences, fewer works being written on religion and Sufism.¹⁵⁵ For example, the *Pertevname* of the famous Iranian Sufi philosopher Shihab al-din al-Suhrawardi (d. 1196), who was also known as Suhrawardi-i Maqtul in order to distinguish him from the famous Sufi from Baghdad Shihab al-din Abu Hafs al-Suhrawardi, was one of the first works of philosophy. His other works include an augury book, *Usul al-Malahim*, which Ebu el-Fazl Hüseyin b. İbrahim el-Tiflisi translated from Arabic into Persian, a book on the interpretation of dreams entitled *Kamil al-Ta'bir* and a work entitled *Bayan al-Nujum* on astronomy. He wrote two books on medicine, *Sihhat al-Abdan* and *Kifayat al-Tibb*, the latter written for the *vali* of Sivas Kutbeddin Melikşah, one of the sons of Kılıç Arslan II. Of his many works written in Persian and Arabic the most important are *Hikmat al-Ishraq* and *al-Talwihat*, which are the main works on the *ishraqi* mystic philosophy which he himself established, and *Hayakil al-Nur*, a very well known little Sufi treatise. We know also that he wrote other works in Anatolia.

Another prose work written in this period is *Ravdat al-Manazir*, composed in Persian by Kemaleddin Ebubekr on Islamic theology. The *Rahat al-Sudur wa Ayat al-Surur* of al-Ravandi, completed in 1206 and dedicated to Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, an important prose work of history and a major source also for Iranian Seljuk history, can be counted among the best examples of Persian prose.

With the gradual strengthening of the Sufi movement in Anatolia from the thirteenth century, there is no doubt that prose compositions were written in this environment, as were translations from Arabic to Persian, and the number of religio-Sufi texts written in Arabic and Turkish increased. For example, among the main examples of Sufi prose were the very well known *Kitab al-Ma'arif* of Mevlana's father, Bahaeddin Veled, the book of the same title by his *halife*, Seyyid Burhaneddin Muhakkık-i Tirmizi, *Maqalat*

155 Ateş, 'Hicrî VI–VIII. (XII–XIV.) Asırlarda Anadolu'da Farsça Eserler', 133–4.

which was a collection of the sayings of Şems-i Tebrizi gathered together from different places, the *Majalis-i Sab'a* of Mevlana, another book entitled *Ma'arif* by his son Sultan Veled, *Mirsad al-'Ibad* of Necmeddin-i Daye, and *Siraj al-Qulub*.

We must also note in particular the *Manahij al-'Ibad ila al-Ma'ad* which was written on the *vahdet-i vücud* doctrine of his master by Sadeddin el-Fergani who was a follower of Muhieddin İbn Arabi, and Fergani's commentary on the famous *Qaside-i Ta'iyya* of the well-known Egyptian follower of the same doctrine, 'Amr ibn al-Farid. Books such as Fahreddin-i Iraki's *Lema'at* and Sadreddin Konevi's *Tabsirat al-Mubtedi wa Tadhkirat al-Muntahi*, as well as the latter's *Nusus* and *Fükuk* (first written as an explanation of the views of İbn Arabi's *Fusas al-Hiqam*), *Risalat al-Vujud* and *Miftah al-Gayb*, must also be mentioned, as must the *Fihi ma fihi* of Mevlana himself, the Persian *menakib-name* of Sipehsalar Ferudun b. Ahmed entitled *Manaqib-i Hadrat-i Khudavandigar* and known by the short title *Risale-i Sipehsalar* which is an important source for the life of the family of Mevlana and his circle, and of course the very well known *Manakib al-Arifin* of Ahmed Eflaki written later on the same subject.

There are various examples in the field of *belles-lettres*, such as the *Rawdat al-Kuttab wa Hadiqat al-Albab* of Ebubekr ibn el-Zeki mentioned earlier which includes texts in Arabic and Persian: the *Gunyat al-Katib wa Munyat al-Talib* of Hasan b. 'Abd el-Mü'min; and the *Mektubat* of Mevlana which contained letters written for various reasons to different high officials of the Seljuk state.

Among the works in the style of *Siyasetnames* (books of diplomacy) which immediately come to mind from the thirteenth century are the Persian *Fustat al-'Adala fi Qawa'id al-Saltana* of Mahmud ibn el-Hatib and *Kitab al-Lata'if al-'Ala'iyya* which Ahmed b. Sa'd el-Erzincani wrote in Arabic for Alaeddin Keykubad I.

In the beylik period very many prose works were written on a variety of subjects. Among these are *Lata'if al-Hikma* and *Metali' al-Anwar* of Mahmud b. Ebibekr el-Urmevi, and *Daqayiq al-Haqayiq* of Nasireddin el-Sicistani on the occult. In the field of history the most significant works include İbn Bibi's very important source *al-'Awamir al-'Ala'iyya*, *Musamarat al-Akhbar* of Karim al-Din Aqsara'i and Aziz b. Ardashir-i Astarabadi's *Bazm o Razm*.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ For more detailed information on prose in Anatolia in the Seljuk and beylik periods see M. İsen, 'Nesir', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurluğu I*, ed. Ocak, pp. 521–32.

Conclusion

To sum up the picture of Turkish intellectual life in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, of which we have tried to give an outline here, we can say that those who came from outside and settled in Turkey in this period, primarily the Turks who gave their name to the region, transformed the lands which had been the cradle of various civilisations over the ages, into a country with a very different society, belief and culture from that which it had had until that point. Over a period of approximately two and a half centuries, *ulema*, Sufis, bureaucrats, poets, men of letters, philosophers, men from every profession and of every type, coming into the region from outside, all Muslims but speaking different languages, tied to different interpretations of Islam, all contributed to the creation and development of every blade of the Anatolian cultural fan, from a new political mentality to a new architecture. Great sultans like Kılıç Arslan II and Alaeddin Keykubad I, great *vezirs* like Sahip Ata Fahreddin, Celaleddin Karatay and Pervane Muineddin Süleyman, great Sufis like Mevlana, Aşık Paşa, Yunus Emre and Hacı Bektaş, and great poets and men of letters like Kani'i, Dehhani, Ahmedi and Şeyhi and many others were the products of this rich and prolific political and intellectual culture created from a synthesis of elements drawn from Central Asia and from every part of the Muslim Middle East. This synthesis produced the most developed language of learning, art and literature of the western Turkish world, creating a version of Anatolian Turkish. This language opened the way to the magnificent political style of Ottoman diplomacy. In short, the intellectual world of medieval Turkey created the basis of the intellectual performance of the Ottoman Empire for the centuries to come.

Glossary

- ağa* lord; commander
- ahi* member of a semi-religious order of the late Seljuk and early Ottoman period recruited mainly from among the ranks of craftsmen devoted to the ideals of *fütüvvet*; *ahilik* was an association which united craftsmen in the Anatolian towns and had a semi-Sufi identity
- akçe* Greek *aspron*, Latin *asper*, silver coin used by the Turkish rulers
- akın* raid
- akıncı* raider; a corps of light cavalry used for raiding
- akritai* Byzantine frontier troops
- alp* hero, brave man
- alp-eren* hero, brave men
- arasta* covered market associated with a mosque
- archon* high-ranking Byzantine official
- asitane* dervish lodge
- askeri* belonging to the military; those who belonged to the military or religious elite and who were granted tax exemption
- asper* see *akçe*
- aspron* see *akçe*
- avarız-i divaniye* extraordinary levies
- azeb* (Arabic *azab*) unmarried young men; seamen or pirates; in Ottoman army apparently land foot soldiers who were enlisted from the peasants for the duration of a campaign
- baba* elder of a dervish group; head of a Bektaşî lodge
- bac* tax, toll or market dues
- bailo* head of a Venetian colony; Venetian representative abroad; Venetian ambassador to Constantinople
- balish* Mongol tax or tribute
- basqaq* a Mongol military governor
- baştina* hereditary estate in the Balkans, a Slavic term taken over by the Ottomans denoting hereditary title to land
- batman* measure of weight
- battimano* see *batman*
- bedestan* covered market, part of a bazaar where valuable merchandise was stored
- besant* term used by Europeans for the gold *dinar*, and for other units of account derived from the *dinar*

- bey* ruler of a Turkish state; commander
beylerbeyi top Ottoman official in provincial government, head of a *beylerbeyilik*
botte a wine measurement varying from place to place
braccia a cloth measurement, an arm's length, exact length varied from place to place
buk Sufi lodge, foundation
buta a wine measurement
buta de Napoli a wine measurement
calbano steelyard balance, see also *stadera*
camlet a type of cloth made, possibly, from camel's fur, and from mohair
canna a cloth measurement
capsa a container for soap
casa see *capsa*
cebeci armourer
cebelü armed retainer
çelebi title of respect; leader of a religious order, particularly of the Mevlevis
cerehor irregular enlisted warriors
çeribaşı a military commander; commander of detachment of *sipahis* in the provinces
chanela a measurement of approximately 10 to 12 palms
çift resmi tax paid for one *çift* of land
çiftlik landholding which could be worked by a pair of oxen
cihad (jihad) Islamic holy war
cizye poll-tax paid by non-Muslims
comerchium customs tax
danişmend an advanced student in a *medrese*
darülhadis school where the traditions of Islam are taught
dede head of a dervish community, in particular the head of the Bektāşi order
defter-i icmal a summary register of revenue
defter-i mufassal a detailed register of revenue
dergah a dervish lodge
devşirme a levy of Christian boys for service in the Ottoman army or in the palace
dinar Arab coin, called *besant* by Europeans, divided into 24 *karati*
dirhem Arab silver coin
dizdar fortress captain
ducat Venetian gold coin
dux governor
ehl-i hiref artists or artisans in palace service
emin agent, superintendent
emir ruler, lord
emir-dad chief of justice
eşkinci (or eşkünci) irregular cavalryman
evkaf defteri *vakıf* register
fardello a bundle, particularly used for silk
fıkıh (Arabic fīqh) Islamic canonical jurisprudence
fusta large galiot, small oared warship
fütüvvet (Arabic futuwwa) a semi-religious movement; the ethics of such a movement
gaza a raid for plunder, later came to mean holy war fought for Islam

- gazi* fighter in *gaza*
gigliato a silver coin common in the eastern Mediterranean in the fourteenth century
gulam-i mir salaried court troops
hacegan departmental head in the bureaucracy
hadith prophetic tradition; sayings and practices of the Prophet Muhammad
halife caliph, successor, officially ordained assistant to a *şeyh*
Halvetiye order of dervishes
hamam public bath
han caravansary, large commercial building; a market building in a town, usually specialising in the trade of a specific commodity, or a place used by merchants from a specific region or country
hane a household as a tax unit
hanekah dervish lodge
haraç poll-tax paid by non-Muslims
has crown lands
hatib the leader of the community at Friday prayers
hisar eri fortress guard
hutbe the sermon delivered in the mosque by the *hatib*
hyperpyron Byzantine gold coin, divided into 24 *karati*, it declined in significance during the fourteenth century, becoming a money of account; after the middle of the fourteenth century the *hyperpyron* in circulation was silver
ikta a grant of revenue from land made to a military or administrative office-holder
ilchi Mongol envoy
imam prayer leader
imaret soup kitchen; religious and social complex supported by a *vakıf*
injü the domain of the Ilkhanate state
ispence originally a poll-tax paid in the Balkans, taken over by the Ottomans as a customary tax
istimalet persuasion; Ottoman policy of accommodating the population in newly conquered territory
kadı judge, chief administrator of a judicial district
kadı sicilleri court registers
kadırga oared galleys with single masts and lateen sails
kalyata large galiot
kantar a measurement of weight
kapan balance used for heavy goods such as foodstuffs
kapudan naval commander
kapukulu ocakları the salaried troops of the palace
karati division of a *hyperpyron*; there were 24 *karati* to one *hyperpyron*
kaza district under the jurisdiction of a *kadı*
kethüda Ottoman government official, agent
kible the direction of Mecca for praying
komerkion customs tax
köşk pavilion
küllîye religious and social complex
künbed tomb

<i>lala</i>	the person who had been tutor to the reigning sultan as a child
<i>mahalle</i>	district, quarter, neighbourhood
<i>mal-i buzurg</i>	central treasury
<i>mal-i yam</i>	courier service
<i>mangır</i>	a copper coin
<i>mazo</i>	a bundle
<i>medrese</i>	school, Muslim theological college
<i>mekteb</i>	school
<i>menakıbnâme</i>	narrative of heroic deeds
<i>mescid</i>	small mosque
<i>mevlevihane</i>	a lodge for Mevlevi dervishes
<i>mezhep</i>	religious denomination; school of thought
<i>mihrab</i>	niche in a mosque indicating the direction of Mecca
<i>minber</i>	pulpit in a mosque
<i>mine</i>	common weight and dry measure
<i>miri</i>	belonging to the ruler or the state
<i>mizan</i>	balance used for cloth and other commodities which were not very weighty
<i>modio</i>	see <i>modius</i>
<i>modius</i>	a dry measure, varying widely according to location
<i>moggio</i>	see <i>modius</i>
<i>mudd</i>	a dry measure, varying according to location, used for grain
<i>müderris</i>	teacher in a <i>medrese</i>
<i>müftü</i> or <i>müfti</i>	jurisconsult
<i>muhassebe defteri</i>	account register
<i>muhtesib</i>	market inspector
<i>mukataa</i>	tax farm; a source of revenue
<i>mülk</i>	freehold ownership
<i>mürîd</i>	Sufi disciple
<i>müselleme</i>	member of a corps of militia performing military service in return for tax exemption
<i>mustahfiz</i>	fortress guard
<i>mustaufi</i>	revenue accountant
<i>müstevi</i>	head of the financial department
<i>nahiye</i>	administrative region, district
<i>naib</i>	deputy, representative
<i>naibüs-saltana</i> (<i>na'ib al-saltana</i>)	sultan's deputy
<i>nazır</i>	superintendent, particularly of a <i>vakıf</i>
<i>noyan</i>	a Mongol commander
<i>nüfus defteri</i>	population register
<i>ocak</i>	infantry corps
<i>ordu</i>	Mongol court
<i>orta</i>	military unit
<i>pani</i>	cloth
<i>paroikos</i>	dependent peasant, who received land to cultivate, though also having the right to own land
<i>patumani</i>	see <i>batman</i>

Glossary

<i>piyade</i>	infantry
<i>podestà</i>	the top government official in Genoese colonies
<i>pronoia</i>	care, forethought; in fiscal terms a grant of land which at times involved military service
<i>prostrator</i>	one of the highest officials in the retinue of the emperor
<i>qubchur</i>	Mongol tax on flocks and herds; poll-tax
<i>quriltay</i>	assembly
<i>reaya</i>	tax-paying population who were not members of the <i>askeri</i> elite
<i>ribat</i>	military station on a frontier, fortified post, lodge for dervishes
<i>rotol</i>	a division of weight, division of a <i>kantar</i>
<i>rüsum</i>	dues, taxes
<i>rüsum-i urfiyye</i>	customary dues
<i>salname</i>	yearbook
<i>sancak</i>	sub-province
<i>sancakbeyi</i>	governor of a sub-province
<i>sanduka</i>	sarcophagus, cenotaph
<i>scarlattini</i>	fine woollen cloth, usually, though not always, scarlet coloured
<i>sekban</i>	military unit
<i>sema</i>	the whirling dance and the music performed during a Mevlevi ceremony
<i>senseraggio</i>	brokerage
<i>serasker</i>	commander of the army
<i>şeriat (Shari'a)</i>	Islamic religious law
<i>şeriyye sicilleri</i>	court registers
<i>seruch</i>	probably a grain measurement
<i>şeyh</i>	sheikh, head; popular religious leader; head of a tribe
<i>seyyid</i>	descendant of the Prophet Muhammad
<i>shihna</i>	military governor
<i>shinik</i>	a capacity measure
<i>şifahane</i>	hospital
<i>simsar</i>	the head of the brokers in a market
<i>sipahi</i>	mounted soldier holding a <i>timar</i> ; a member of the sultan's cavalry
<i>società</i>	business partnership
<i>solak</i>	a military unit
<i>solakbaşı</i>	the commander of a <i>solak</i>
<i>sommo</i>	silver coin used in Black Sea region
<i>stadera</i>	steelyard balance with one arm
<i>staperronos</i>	cloth measurement
<i>strategos</i>	Byzantine commander in charge of a <i>theme</i> and its troops
<i>subaşı</i>	commander; a government agent
<i>sürgün</i>	deportation
<i>taghar</i>	provisioning
<i>tahrir</i>	survey of land, population and sources of revenue
<i>tahrir defteri</i>	written survey of a province
<i>tamgha</i>	Mongol tax on commercial transactions
<i>tarikāt</i>	Sufi order
<i>tefsir</i>	commentary on the Quran

Glossary

<i>tekalif-i urfiyye (tekalif-i örfiyye)</i>	customary dues
<i>tekfur</i>	local Byzantine ruler
<i>tekke</i>	dervish lodge
<i>temlik</i>	grant of freehold property rights
<i>themes</i>	troops
<i>timar</i>	revenue allotment in return for military service; a Persian term meaning care, forethought, solicitude
<i>timar eri</i>	holder of a <i>timar</i>
<i>topçı</i>	artillery corps
<i>topçibaşı</i>	chief gunner
<i>tüfenkçi</i>	gunner unit
<i>tuman</i>	10,000, a Mongol military division
<i>türbe</i>	grave, tomb
<i>uc</i>	frontier region
<i>uç beyi</i>	marcher lord
<i>vakfiyye</i>	deed of trust of a <i>vakıf</i>
<i>vakıf</i>	pious foundation
<i>vakıfname</i>	deed of trust
<i>vali</i>	governor
<i>veli</i>	holy man
<i>vegeta de Napoli</i>	wine measurement
<i>vezir</i>	a minister of the sultan
<i>vilayet</i>	province
<i>waqf</i>	see <i>vakıf</i>
<i>yamak</i>	assistant
<i>yarghuchi</i>	Mongol judge
<i>yarligh</i>	decree
<i>yaya</i>	footman, infantry
<i>yeniçeri</i>	janissary
<i>yıldızname</i>	astrological book for predicting the future
<i>yoldaş</i>	companion, retainer
<i>yoldaşlık</i>	originally denoted companionship and performing service as a retainer of a military leader; came to mean participation in a campaign and a display of bravery
<i>yük</i>	a load, a weight measurement varying widely according to merchandise and location
<i>yürük</i>	Turkoman nomad
<i>zaviye</i>	dervish lodge
<i>zeamet</i>	land held in return for military service
<i>zeugarion/jugum</i>	Byzantine designation for the amount of land which could be ploughed by a pair of oxen
<i>zimmi (Arabic dhimmi)</i>	non-Muslim living under Islamic ruler

Bibliography

Published primary sources

- Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir, *al-Rawd al-zahir fî sirat al-malik al-zahir*, ed. 'A. 'A. Khuwaytir, Riyad, 1396/1976.
- Abdurrahman Hibri, *Abdurrahman Hibri, Enîsü'l-Müsâmirîn – Edirne Tarihi*, ed. Ratip Kazancıgil, Edirne, 1996.
- Abu Bakr ibn al-Zaki, *Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadîqat al-Albâb*, ed. Ali Sevim, Ankara, 1972.
- Abu'l-Fida, *al-Mukhtasar fî ta'rih al-bashar*, tr. P. M. Holt as *The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince*, Wiesbaden, 1983.
- Taqwîm al-Buldân*, ed. T. Reinaud and M. de Slane, Paris, 1840.
- Adamović, M., *Kelîle ü Dimne. Türkische Handschrift T 189 Der Forschungsbibliothek Gotha*, Hildesheim, 1994.
- Ahmedi, 'Ahmedi Divanı (Tenkitli Metin ve Dil Hususiyetleri, I-II)', in Yaşar Akdoğan, unpublished doctoral thesis, Istanbul University, 1979.
- 'Ahmedi's History of the Ottoman Dynasty', tr. Kemal Silay, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 (1992), 129–200.
- Ahmedi, İskender-Nâme (İnceleme – Tıpkıbasım)*, ed. İsmail Ünver, Ankara, 1983.
- Ahri, Abu Bakr, *Tarikh-i Shaikh Uvais*, ed. and tr. J. B. van Loon, The Hague, 1954.
- Akalın, Mehmet, *Ahmedi Cemşid ü Hurşid (İnceleme – Metin)*, Ankara, 1975.
- Akgündüz, Ahmed, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukûkî Tahlilleri*, Istanbul, 1996.
- Akkaya, Ş., *Kitâb-ı Melik Dânişmend Gazi: Eine Türkische Historischer Heldenroman aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Ankara, 1954.
- Akropolites, George, *George Akropolites: The History*, tr. Ruth Macrides, Oxford, 2007.
- Opera*, ed. A. Heisenberg, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1903.
- Opera*, ed. A. Heisenberg, revised P. Wirth, Stuttgart, 1978.
- Aktaş, Necati, Mustafa Kaplan and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer (eds.), *167 Numaralı Muhasebe-i Vilayet-i Rum İli Defteri (937/1530)*, 2 vols., Ankara, 2003–4.
- Anagnostes, Johannis, *Διήγησις περὶ τῆς τελευταίας ἀλώσεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Μον-φάρια ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης*, ed. Y. Tsaras, Thessalonike, 1958.
- Selanik (Thessaloniki)* 'in *Son Zaptı Hakkında Bir Tarihi (Sultan II. Murad Dönemine Ait Bir Bizans Kaynağı)*, tr. Melek Delilbaşı, Ankara, 1989.
- Anonymous, *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq dar Anatuli*, ed. Nadira Jalali, Tehran, 1377/1999.
- Ansbertus, *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. Josepho Dobrowsky, Prague, 1827.

- Aqsara'i, Karim al-Din, *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr: Moğollar Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*, ed. O. Turan, Ankara, 1944.
- Müsâmeretü'l-Ahbâr*, tr. Mürsel Öztürk, Ankara, 2000.
- Selçuki Devletleri Tarihi. Aksaraylı Kerimeddin Mahmud'un Müsameret al-ahyar Adlı Farsça Tarihinin Tercümesi*, tr. M. Nuri Gencosman, Ankara, 1943.
- Argunşah, Mustafa, *Kirdecî Ali, Kesikbaş Destanı*, Ankara, 2002.
- Muhammed b. Mahmûd-ı Şîrvânî, *Tuhfe-ı Murâdî (İnceleme-Metin-Dizin)*, Ankara, 1999.
- Aşık Paşa, Aşık Paşa, *Garib-Nâme (Tıpkıbasım, Karşılaştırmak Metin ve Aktarma)*, ed. Kemal Yavuz, 4 vols., Ankara, 2000.
- Aşıkpaşazade, *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Âşıkpaşazâde*, ed. Friedrich Giese, Leipzig, 1929.
- Osmanoğulları'nın Tarihi*, ed. Kemal Yavuz and M. A. Yekta Saraç, İstanbul, 2003.
- Tevârih-i Al-i Osman, Aşıkpaşazade Tarihi*, ed. Ali, İstanbul, 1332 [1916].
- Vom Hirtenzelt zur Hohen Pforte, tr. Richard F. Kreutel, Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1959.
- [Aşıkpaşazade] Aşıkpaşaoğlu Ahmed Aşiki, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, vol. I, ed. N. Çiftçioglu, İstanbul, 1949, pp. 91-319.
- Astarabadi, 'Aziz b. Ardashir, *Bazm va razm*, ed. K. Rifat, İstanbul, 1928.
- Attaleiates, Michael, *Historia*, ed. with Spanish tr. I. Pérez Martín, Madrid, 2002.
- Azamat, Nihat (ed.), *Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman – F. Giese Neşri*, İstanbul, 1992.
- Babinger, Franz, *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch*, Hanover, 1925.
- Badoer, Giacomo, *Il Libro dei Conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli 1436-1440)*, ed. Umberto Dorini and Tommaso Bertelè, Rome, 1956.
- Baibars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-fikra fi ta'rih al-hijra*, ed. D. S. Richards, Berlin, 1998.
- Balard, Michel, *Notai genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (31 Marzo-19 Luglio 1305, 4 Genaio-12 Luglio 1307), Giovanni de Rocha (3 Agosto 1308-14 Marzo 1310)*, Genoa, 1984.
- Balard, Michel, Angeliki E. Laiou and Catherine Otten-Froux, *Les Italiens à Byzance. Edition et présentation de documents*, Paris, 1987.
- Banarlı, Nihâd Sâmî, *XIV üncü Asır Anadolu Şâirlerinden Ahmedi'nin Osmanlı Tarihi Dâsitân-ı Tevârih-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman ve Cemşîd ve Hurşîd Mesnevisi*, İstanbul, 1939.
- Bar Hebraeus (Ibn al-'Ibri), *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj*, vol. I, tr. E. A. W. Budge, London, 1932.
- Gregory Abu'l-Farac (Bar Hebraeus) Abu'l-Farac Tarihi*, tr. Ömer Rıza Doğrul, 2 vols., Ankara, 1987.
- Ta'rih mukhtasar al-duwal*, Beirut, 1992.
- Barbaro, Nicolò, *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople*, tr. J. R. Jones, New York, 1969.
- Giornale dell'assedio di Costantinopoli 1453*, ed. E. Cornet, Vienna, 1856.
- Beldiceanu, Nicolară, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris*, 2 vols., Paris and La Haye, 1960-4.
- (ed.), *Code de lois coutumière de Mehmed II. Kitâb-i Qavânîn-i 'Örfiyye-i 'Osmânî*, Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Belgrano, L. T., 'Documenti riguardanti la colonia genovese di Pera', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia della Patria* 13 (1877-84), 99-317.
- 'Seconde serie di documenti riguardanti la colonia di Pera', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia della Patria* 13 (1877-84), 931-1004.

Bibliography

- Broquière, Bertrandon de la, *Le voyage d'Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière*, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris, 1892.
- Voyage d'Outremer*, tr. Galen R. Kline, New York, 1988.
- Bryennios, Nikephoros, *Histoire*, ed. and tr. P. Gautier, Brussels, 1975.
- Caffaro, *Annali genovesi*, vol. I, ed. L. T. Belgrano, in *Fonti della storia d'Italia*, vol. II, Genoa, 1890.
- Cengiz, Halil Erdoğan and Yaşar Yücel, 'Rûhî Târîhi', *Belgeler* 14, 18 (1989–92), 359–472.
- Ceyhan, Adem, *Bedr-i Dilşad'ın Murâd-Nâmesi I–II*, Istanbul, 1997.
- Chalkokondyles, Laonikos, *Historiarum Demonstrationes*, ed. E. Darkó, Budapest, 1922–7.
- Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols., Bonn, 1843.
- Chinazzo, Daniele di, *Cronica de la guerra da Veneciani a Zenovesi*, ed. V. Lazzarini, in *Monumenti storici deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie*, n.s., XI, Venice, 1958.
- Choniates, Michael, Τὰ σωζόμενα, ed. Sp. Lampros, 2 vols., Athens, 1880.
- Choniates, Niketas, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, 2 vols., Berlin, 1975.
- O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, tr. H. J. Magoulias, Detroit, 1984.
- Chrysostomides, J. (ed.), *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Documents for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries*, Camberley, 1995.
- Clavijo, Ruy Gonzalez de, *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, AD 1403–6*, tr. Clements R. Markham, London, 1859.
- Dandolo, Andrea, *Cronaca*, ed. E. Pastorello, Bologna, 1938.
- Ibn al-Dawadari, *Kanz al-durar wa jami' al-ghurar*, vol. IX, ed. H. R. Roemer, Cairo, 1960.
- Dei, Benedetto, *Dei, La cronica dell'anno 1400 all'anno 1500*, ed. Roberto Barducci, Florence, 1990.
- Delilbaşı, Melek and Muzaffer Arıkan, *Hicrî 859 Tarihli Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-ı Tırhala*, 2 vols., Ankara, 2001.
- Demir, Necati, *Dânişmend-nâme*, Ankara, 2004.
- Dennis, G. T., 'The Byzantine–Turkish Treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88.
- Dernschwam, H., *Hans Dernschwam's Tagebuch: Einer Reise Nach Konstantinopel*, ed. Franz Babinger, Munich, 1923.
- Al-Dhahabi, *Kitab duwal al-Islam*, tr. Arlette Negre as *Les dynasties de l'Islam*, Damascus, 1979.
- Dilçin, Cem, *Mes'ûd Bin Ahmed, Süheyl ü Nev-Bahâr (İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük)*, Ankara, 1991.
- Dölger, F., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches 565–1453*, re-ed. A. E. Müller, Munich, 2003.
- Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, ed. and tr. H. J. Magoulias, Detroit, 1975.
- Ducæ Historia Turcobyzantina (1341–1462)*, ed. B. Grecu, Bucharest, 1958.
- Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1843.
- Eflaki, Ahmed, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, Istanbul, 2006.
- Manâkib al-Arifin*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, 2 vols., Ankara, 1959.
- Les saints des derviches tourneurs*, ed. and tr. Cl. Huart, 2 vols., Paris, 1918.
- Elezović, Gliša, *Turski Spomenici*, 1 vol., 2 parts, Belgrade, 1940–52.
- Elvan Çelebi, *Menâkibu'l-Kudsîyye Fî Menâsibi'l-Ünsîyye (Baba İlyas-ı Horasânî ve Sülâlesinin Menkabevî Tarihi)*, ed. İsmail E. Erünsal and A. Yaşar Ocak, Ankara, 1995.

- Enveri, *Le Destan d'Umūr Pacha (Düsturnāme-i Enverī): text, translation et notes*, ed. and tr. I. Mélikoff-Sayar, Paris, 1954.
- Düsturname-i Enveri*, ed. M. Halil, Istanbul, 1928.
- Fatih Devri Kaynaklarından Düsturnāme-i Enverī Osmanlı Tarihi Kısmı (1299–1466)*, ed. Necdet Öztürk, Istanbul, 2003.
- Ergin, Muharrem, *Dede Korkut Kitabı*, vol. I: *Giriş – Metin – Faksimile*; vol. II: *İndeks, Gramer*, Ankara, 1958–63.
- Kadı Burhaneddin Divanı*, Istanbul, 1980.
- Esterâbâdî, Aziz b. Erdeşir, *Anadolu Türklerine ait Tarihi Menba'lar I: Bezm u Rezm*, ed. Köprülüzâde M. Fuad, Istanbul, 1928.
- Bezm u Rezm*, tr. Mürsel Öztürk, Ankara, 1990.
- Estopañan, S. Cirac (ed.), *Chronicle of Ioannina*, in *Bizancio y España*, 2 vols., Barcelona, 1943.
- Eustathios of Thessalonike, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakides, tr. V. Rotolo, intro. B. Lavagnini, Palermo, 1961.
- Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahat-namesi*, 10 vols., Istanbul, 1314/1896/7–1938.
- Fleet, Kate, 'The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 56, 1 (1993), 13–33.
- Ibn al-Fuwatî', *Kitab al-hawadith*, ed. B.'A. Ma'ruf and 'I.'A. Ru'uf, Baghdad, 1997.
- Gautier, P., 'Diatribes de Jean Oxite contre Alexis Ier Comnène', *Revue des Études Byzantines* 28 (1970), 5–55.
- Georgius de Hungaria, 'Incipit prohemium in tractatum de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia Turcorum'. *Értekezés a törökök szokásairól, viszonyairól és gonoszságáról 1438–1458*. Hungarian translation by Győző Kenéz in *Rabok, követek, kalmárok az oszmán birodalomról*, ed. Lajos Tardy, Budapest, 1977, pp. 50–153.
- Giese, Friedrich (ed.), *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken in Text und Übersetzung*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1922–5.
- Glykas, Michael, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1836.
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, *XV–XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı, Vakıflar – Mülkler – Mukataalar*, Istanbul, 1952.
- Gölpınarlı, A., *Mesnevî Tercümesi ve Şerhi*, 6 vols., Istanbul, 1981–4.
- Gregoras, Nicephorus, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols., Bonn, 1829–55.
- Gülşehrî, *Mantuku't-Tayr*, ed. Agah Sırrı Levend, Ankara, 1957.
- Hill, R. (ed. and tr.), *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, London, 1962.
- Iacopo de Promontorio, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis über den Osmanenstaat um 1475*, ed. Franz Babinger, Munich, 1957.
- Ibn Battuta, *Muhadhdhab Rihlat Ibn Batoutah: Tuhfat al-Nuzzar fi Ghara'ib al-Amsar wa 'Aja'ib al-Asfâr*, ed. by A. al-Awamiri and M. A. al-Mawla, 2 vols., Cairo, 1933.
- The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, ed. and tr. H. A. R. Gibb, 4 vols., London, 1962.
- Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, vol. II, tr. C. Defrémery and R. Sanguinetti, Paris, 1877.
- Ibn Bibi, *Akhbar-i Salajiqā-yi Rum*, ed. M. J. Mashkur, Tehran, 1350/1971.
- Al-Awamir al-'ala'iyya fi'l-umur al-'ala'iyya*, facs. ed. Adnan Sadık Erzi, *El-Evāmīrū'l-'Alā'iyye fi'l-umūri'l-'Alā'iyye*, Ankara, 1956.
- El-Evāmīrū'l-'Alā'iyye fi'l-Umuri'l-'Alā'iyye (Selçuk Name)*, tr. Mürsel Öztürk, 2 vols., Ankara, 1996.
- Selçuknâme*, tr. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, Istanbul, 2007.

- Die Selttschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi*, tr. H. W. Duda, Copenhagen, 1959.
- Ibn Bibi, anonymous abbr., ed. M. Th. Houtsma, in *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoudes*, vol. IV, Leiden, 1902.
- Ibn Shaddad, *Ta'rikh al-malik al-zahir*, ed. A. Hutayt, Wiesbaden, 1983.
- Ignace of Smolensk, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople*, ed. G. P. Majeska, Washington, DC, 1984.
- Imperiale, C. (ed.), *Codice diplomatico della repubblica di Genova*, 3 vols., Rome, 1936–42.
- İnalçık, Halil, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, vol. I, Ankara, 1987.
- (ed.), *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, Ankara, 1987.
- İnalçık, Halil and Mevlud Oğuz (eds.), *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd b. Mehmed Hân. İzladî ve Varna Savaşları (1443–1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavâtname*, Ankara, 1978.
- Iorga, N., *Notes et extraits pour servir a l'histoire de croisades au XVe siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1899–1902.
- 'Notes et extraits pour servir a l'histoire de croisades au XVe siècle: comptes des colonies gènoise de Caffa, Pera et de Famagusta', *Revue de l'Orient Latin* 4 (1896), 25–118.
- İsen, Mustafa and C. Kurnaz, *Şeyhî Divanı*, Ankara, 1990.
- al-Jazari, *Hawadith al-zaman*, tr. J. Sauvaget as *La chronique de Damas d'al-Jazari (Années 689–698 H)*, Paris, 1949.
- Juvaini, 'Ata-Malik, *The History of the World Conqueror*, tr. J. A. Boyle, 2 vols., Manchester, 1958.
- Tarikh-i Jahangusha*, ed. M. Qazvini, 3 vols., London, 1912, 1916, 1937.
- Juzjani, *Tabaqat-i Nasiri*, ed. 'A. Habibi, repr., Tehran, 1363/1984.
- Kalonaros, P. P., *Tò χρονικόν τοῦ Μορέως*, Athens, 1940.
- Kantakouzenos, Johannes, *Geschichte*, ed. Georgios Fatouros and Tilman Krischer, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1986.
- Ioannes Cantakuzeni ex imperatoris historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols., Bonn, 1828–32.
- Kashani, *Tarikh-i Uljaitu*, ed. M. Hambly, Tehran, 1348/1969.
- Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân*, in Ahmed Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukûkî Tahlilleri*, vol. IX, Istanbul, 1996, pp. 130–367.
- Kazvini, Z. M., *Athar al-Bilad wa Akhbar al-'Ibad*, Beirut, 1960.
- Kekaumenos, *Strategicon*, ed. B. Wassiliewsky and V. Jernstedt, St Petersburg, 1896, repr. 1965.
- Kemal Paşa-oğlu Şemsüddin Ahmed İbn-i Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman, II. Defter*, ed. Şerafettin Turan, Ankara, 1983.
- İbn Kemal (Kemal paşazade) Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman IV. Defter*, ed. Koji Imazawa, Ankara, 2000.
- Keykavus b. İskender, *Kabusname*, tr. Ahmet Mercimek, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1966.
- Kitâb-ı Nasihat-nâme Ma'rûf be-Kâbûs-nâme*, ed. Sa'îd Nefisi Musahhih, Tehran, AH 1368.
- Ibn Khaldun, *Kitab al-'ibar wa diwan al-mubtada*, 7 vols., ed. J. A. Dagher, Beirut, n.d. (?1967).
- Kinnamos, John, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, tr. C. M. Brand, New York, 1976.
- Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke, Bonn, 1836.
- Kocatürk, Saadetin, *Gülşehrî ve Felek-Nâme (İnceleme ve Metin)*, Ankara, 1984.
- Köksal, Hasan, *Battal Gazi Destanı*, Ankara, 2003.
- Komnene, Anna, *The Alexiad*, tr. E. R. A. Sewter, London, 1969.

- Alexiade, ed. and tr. B. Leib, 3 vols., Paris, 1965.
- Alexias, ed. D. R. Reinsch and A. Kambylis, Berlin and New York, 2001.
- Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs of a Janissary*, tr. Benjamin Stolz, Ann Arbor, 1975.
- Memoiren eines Janitscharen oder Türkische Chronik*, tr. Renate Lachmann, Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1975.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep, *Sadru'd-Din Şeyhoğlu, Marzuban-Nâme Tercümesi (İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük-Tipkibasım)*, Ankara, 1973.
- Kourouses, St. I., *Μανουήλ Γαβαλάς, ἔτα Ματθαῖος μητροπολίτης Ερέσου (1271/2–1355/60)*, Athens, 1972.
- Kritoboulos, Michael, *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. D. R. Reinsch, Berlin, 1983.
- History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, by Kritovoulos, tr. C. T. Riggs, Westport, Conn., 1954.
- De Rebus per Annos 1451–1467 a Mechemet II Gestis*, ed. V. Grecu, Bucharest, 1963.
- Vie de Mahomet II*, tr. Th. A. Dethier, Budapest, n.d.
- Kydones, Demetrius, *Démétrius Cydonès correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, 2 vols., Vatican City, 1956–60.
- Oratio pro Subsidia Latinorum*, in *Patrologica Graecia*, vol. CLIV, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, 1880, cols. 961–1008.
- Lami'i Çelebi, *Nafahat Al-Uns*, Istanbul, 1270.
- Lemerle, P., André Guillou and Nicolas Svoronos (eds.), *Actes de Lavra. Edition diplomatique*, 4 vols., Paris, 1970–82.
- Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, ed. A. Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885.
- Loenertz, R. J., 'La chronique brève moréote de 1423. texte, traduction et commentaire', in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. II, Vatican, 1964, pp. 399–439.
- (ed.), *Theodori Ioann. F. Palaeologi, Titulus metricus AD 1389*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 25 (1955), 207–10.
- Ludolphus de Sudheim, *De Itinere Terre Sancte*, ed. G. A. Neumann, *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, vol. II, Paris, 1884, pp. 305–77.
- Ludolphi rectoris ecclesiae parochialis in Suchem, De itinere Terrae Sancta e liber*, ed. F. Deycks, in *Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins XXV*, Stuttgart, 1851.
- Macrembolites, Alexios, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, vol. I, St Petersburg, 1891.
- al-Maqrizi, *Kitab al-suluk li-ma'rifat duwal al-muluk*, ed. M. M. Ziyada, 4 vols., Cairo, 1941–58.
- 'Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini (1212–1354)', in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. G. Carducci and V. Fiorini, vol. XVI, pt. 3, Città di Castello, 1912.
- Massa, Paola, 'Alcune lettere mercantile toscane da colonie genovesi alla fine del trecento', in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia della Patria*, n.s. II, fasc. II (1971), 345–59.
- Matthew of Edessa, *The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, tr. A. E. Dostourian, New York and London, 1993.
- Recit de la première croisade, extrait de la chronique de Matthieu d'Edesse*, tr. E. Dulaurier, Paris, 1858.
- Mazıoğlu, Hasibe, *Ahmed Fakih, Kitâbu Evsâfi Mesâcidi's-Şerîfe*, Ankara, 1974.
- Mehmed Fuad, Köprülü, 'Feraheng-nâme-i Sa'dî Yâhud Muhtasar Bostân Tercümesi, Nâzımı: Hoca Mes'ûd ve Süheyl ü Nev-Bahâr Nâzımı: Sekizinci 'Asr-ı Hicrî Şu'arâsından Mes'ûd Bin Ahmed', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1928), 481–9.

- Mehmed Mecdi Efendi, *Hadâiku's Şekâik*, 5 vols., Istanbul 1268 [1852], ed. Abülkadir Özcan, Istanbul, 1989.
- Mélikoff, I. (ed. and tr.), *La Geste de Melik Dânişmend: étude critique du Dânişmendnâme*, Paris, 1960.
- Mesarites, Nikolaos, *Der Epitaphios auf seinem Bruder Johannes*, ed. A. Heisenberg, in *Quellen und Studien zur spätbyzantinischen Geschichte*, Aldershot, 1973, pp. 16–72.
- Mevlana Celaleddin Muhammed-i Mevlevî yi Rumi, *Kulliyât-ı Dîvân-ı Şems-i Tebrizî (Be-Inzimâm: Seyr der-Dîvân-i Şems Be-Kalem-i Alî Deştî – Şerh-i Hâl-i Mevlevî Be-Kalem-i Bediüzzamân Firûzanfer)*, Tehran, AH 1345.
- Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, *Dîvân-i Kebîr*, tr. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, 7 vols., Eskişehir, 1992.
- The Mathnawî*, ed. Reynold A. Nicholson, 8 vols., London, 1925–40.
- Mesnevî*, tr. Veled İzbudak and Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, 6 vols., Istanbul, 1988.
- Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and tr. J. Chabot, 5 vols., Paris, 1899–1924.
- Miklosich, F. and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, vol. III, Vienna, 1865.
- Morel-Fatio, A. (ed.), *Libro de los fechos*, Geneva, 1885.
- al-Mufaddal b. Abu'l-Fada'il, *al-Nahj al-sadiid*, ed. E. Blochet, in 'Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks (part III)', *Patrologia Orientalis* 20 (1929), 1–270.
- Müller, G., *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente*, Florence, 1879, repr. 1966.
- Muntaner, R., *The Chronicle of Muntaner*, tr. from the Catalan by Lady Goodenough, London, 1921.
- L'expedició dels Catalans a Orient*, ed. Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer, Barcelona, 1926.
- Mustaufi, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulûb Composed by Hamd-Allâh Mustawfî of Qazwin in 740 [1340]*, tr. G. Le Strange, Leiden and London, 1919.
- Tarikh-i Guzida*, ed. 'A. Nava'i, Tehran, 1362/1983.
- Zafarnama*, facs. ed. Nasrollah Pourjavadi and Nosratollah Rastegar, 2 vols., Tehran and Vienna, 1377/1999.
- Zail-i Zafarnama*, facs. ed. V. Z. Piriev, Baku, 1978.
- Naugerii, Andraea, 'Historia Veneta', in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. L. A. Muratori, 25 vols., Milan, 1723–51, vol. XXV.
- Neşri, *Gihannûma: die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlana Mehmed Neschrî*, vol. I: *Einleitung und Text des Cod. Menzel*, ed. Franz Taeschner, Leipzig, 1951.
- Kitab-ı Cihân-nümâ*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmet A. Köymen, 2 vols., Ankara, 1949, 1957.
- Noiret, H., *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485*, Paris, 1892.
- al-Nuwairi, *Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab*, vol. XXVII, ed. S. 'Ashur, Cairo, 1405/1985.
- Nihayat al-arab fi funun al-adab*, vol. XXXI, ed. A. al-'Arini, Cairo, 1412/1992.
- Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and tr. V. G. Berry, New York, 1948.
- Oikonomides, N. (ed.), *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles*, Paris, 1972.
- Ordo portae – Description grèque de la porte et de l'armée du Sultan Mehmed II*, tr. Şerif Baştav, Budapest, 1947.
- Oruç, *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch*, ed. Franz Babinger, Hanover, 1925.
- Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, ed. N. Atsız, Istanbul, 1972.

- Özkan, M., Mahmûd B. Kâdî-i Manyâs, *Gülistân Tercümesi (Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük)*, Ankara, 1993.
- Özmen, Mehmet, *Ahmed-i Dâ'î Divanı I (Metin-Gramer-Tıpkı Basım), II (Dizin)*, Ankara, 2001.
- Pachymeres, George, *De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis libri XIII*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols., Bonn, 1835.
- Relations historiques*, I, *Livres I–III*; II, *IV–VI*, ed. and tr. Albert Failler and Vitalien Laurent, Paris, 1984; III, *Livres VII–IX*; IV, *Livres X–XIII*; V, *Index*, ed. Albert Failler, Paris, 2000.
- Palaeologos, Manuel II, *Dialoge mit einem 'Perser'*, ed. E. Trapp, *Wiener byzantinische Studien* II, Vienna, 1968.
- Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore*, ed. J. Chrysostomides, Thessalonike, 1985.
- The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*, ed. G. T. Dennis, Washington, DC, 1977.
- Manuel II. Palaiologos. *Dialoge mit einem Muslim*, ed. and tr. K. Förstel, 2 vols., Würzburg-Alterberge, 1993 and 1995.
- Manuel II Paléologue, *Entretiens avec un Musulman: 7e Controverse*, ed. and tr. Th. Khoury, Paris, 1966.
- Palaeologos, Michael VIII, *De vita sua*, ed. H. Grégoire, 'Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi De vita sua', *Byzantion* 29–30 (1959–60), 447–74.
- Pegolotti, Fr Balducci Pegolotti, *La Pratica della Mercature*, ed. A. Evans, Cambridge, Mass., 1936.
- Pertusi, Agostino, 'Primi studi in occidente sull'origine e la potenza dei Turchi', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 465–552.
- Peter the Venerable, *The Letters*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
- Philippidis-Braat, Anna, 'La captivité de Palamas chez les Turcs: dossier et commentaire', *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979), 109–222.
- Piloti, *L'Égypte au commencement du quinzième siècle d'après le traité d'Emmanuel Piloti de Crète (Incipit 1420) avec une introduction et des notes par P.-H. Dopp*, Cairo, 1950.
- Planoudes, *Maximi monachi Planudis epistolae*, ed. M. Treu, Breslau, 1890.
- Polo, Marco, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, tr. and ed. Henry Yule, London, 1921.
- Le Livre de Marco Polo citoyen de Venise conseiller privé et commissaire impérial de Khoubilai-Kaân rédigé en français sous sa dictée en 1298 par Rusticien de Pise*, ed. M. G. Pauthier, Paris, 1865.
- The Travels of Marco Polo*, tr. Aldo Ricci with an introduction and index by Sir E. Dennison Ross, London, 1931.
- Polonio, Valeria, *Notai genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (3 Iuglio 1300–3 Agosto 1301)*, Genoa, 1982.
- Porphyrogenitos, Constantine, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. and tr. Gy. Moravcsik and R. H. J. Jenkins, *Dumbarton Oaks*, Washington, DC, 1967.
- Pozza, M. and G. Ravagnani (eds.), *I trattati con Bizancio, 992–1198*, Venice, 1993.
- (eds.), *I trattati con Bizancio, 1265–1285*, Venice, 1996.
- Psellos, Michael, *Chronographie*, ed. and tr. E. Renauld, 2 vols., Paris, 1926–8.
- Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*, tr. E. R. A. Sewter, London, 1966.
- Pulaha, Selami, *Le cadastre de l'an 1485 du sandjak de Shkoder. Présentation, introduction, translittération, traduction et commentaire*, 2 vols., Tirana, 1974.
- Qazwini, Zakariya ibn Muhammad, *Atâr al-Bilâd wa Akhbâr al-Ibâd*, Beirut, 1960.
- Rashid al-Din, *Jamî' al-tawarikh*, ed. M. Raushan and M. Musavi, 4 vols., Tehran, 1373/1994.

- The Successors of Genghis Khan*, tr. J. A. Boyle, London and New York, 1971.
- Ratti Vidulich, Paola, *Duca di Candia Bandi (1313–1329)*, Venice, 1965.
- Duca di Candia*, Quatenus (1340–1350), Venice, 1976.
- Res Gestae Theodori Ioann. F. Palaeologi, *Titulus metricus AD 1389*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 25 (1955), 207–10.
- Rubio I. Lluch, A., *Diplomatari de l'Orient Català*, Barcelona, 1947, repr. 2001.
- Saadeddin, *Chronica dell'origine e processi della Casa Ottomana*, tr. V. Brattuti, Vienna, 1649.
- Tâcü't-tevârih*, vol. I, Istanbul, 1279/1862–3.
- Šabanović, Hazim, *Krajište Isa-bega Ishakovića. Zbirni katastarski popis iz 1455. godine*, Sarajevo, 1964.
- al-Safadi, *al-waḡi bi'l-wafayat*, vol. VIII, ed. M. Y. Najm, Wiesbaden, 1971.
- Sâkib Dede, *Safina-i nafisa-i mawlawiyan*, 3 vols., Cairo, AH 1283.
- Sanudo, Marino, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Secreta Fidelium Crucis*, ed. J. Bongars, 2 vols., Hanover, 1611.
- Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren*, *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. VII, ed. Fr. Kuntsmann, Munich, 1855.
- Sathas, C. N., *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, 9 vols., Paris, 1880–90.
- Schiltberger, Johann, *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria*, in *Europe, Asia and Africa, 1396–1427*, tr. J. Buchan Telfer, London, 1879.
- Schreiner, P. (ed.), *Chronica Byzantina Breviora. Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1975–9.
- Shabankara'i, *Majma' al-ansab*, ed. M. Hashim Muhaddith, Tehran, 1363/1984.
- al-Shuja'i, *Ta'rikh al-malik al-nasir Muhammad b. Qalawun al-salihi wa awladihi*, ed. B. Schäfer, Wiesbaden, 1977.
- Şikari, *Karamanname*, ed. Metin Sözen and Necdet Sakaoğlu, Istanbul, 2005.
- Şikari'nin Karaman Oğulları Tarihi, ed. M. M. Koman, Konya, 1946.
- Sinan de Saint-Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum*, ed. Jean Richard, Paris, 1965.
- Sinan Paşa, *Tezkiretü'l-Evliyâ*, ed. E. Gürsoy Naskali, Ankara, 1988.
- Skylitzes, John, *Continuatus*, ed. E. T. Tsolakes, *Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς Χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτζη*, Thessalonike, 1968.
- Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. Thurn, Berlin and New York, 1973.
- Smbat, *La chronique attribuée au Connétable Smbat*, tr. G. Dédéyan, Paris, 1980.
- Smitt, J. (ed.), *The Chronicle of the Morea*, London, 1904, repr. 1967.
- Sokoloski, Metodija (ed.), *Turski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod*, 4 vols., Skopje, 1963–72.
- Spandounes, Theodore, *On the Origin of the Ottoman Emperors*, tr. Donald M. Nicol, Cambridge, 1997.
- Sphrantzes, George, *Cronaca*, ed. and tr. R. Maisano, Rome, 1990.
- The Fall of the Byzantine Empire: a Chronicle by George Sphrantzes, 1401–1477*, tr. Marios Philippides, Amherst, 1980.
- Stojanović, Ljubomir, *Stari stpski zapisi i nadpisi*, Belgrade, 1908.
- Stojanovski, Aleksandar and Mihailo Apostolski (eds.), *Turski dokumenti za istorija na makedonskiot narod*, Skopje, 1972.
- Subki, Taqi al-din, *Tabaqat al-shafi'iyyat al-kubra*, Beirut, n.d.
- Sultan Veled, *İbtidâ-Nâme*, ed. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, Ankara, 1976.

- Syropoulos, Sylvestre, *Les 'Mémoires' du Grand Ecclésiarche de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439)*, ed. V. Laurent, Rome, 1971.
- Tafel, G. L. F., and G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit Besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante. vom neunten bis zum Ausgang des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–7, repr. Amsterdam, 1964.
- Tarlan, A. N., *Şeyhî Divanı'nı Tetkik*, Istanbul, 1964.
- Tekin, A. G., *Ahmed-i Dâ'î, Çengnâme: a Critical Edition and Textual Analysis*, Cambridge, Mass., 1992.
- Temir, Ahmet, *Kırşehir Emiri Nur el-Din'in 1272 Tarihli Arapça-Moğolca Vakfiyesi*, Ankara, 1959.
- Thiriet, F., *Délibérations des assemblées vénitiennes concernant la Roumanie*, 2 vols., Paris and The Hague, 1964.
- Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, 3 vols., Paris, 1958–61.
- Thomas, G. and R. Predelli (eds.), *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levanticum, sive Acta et Diplomata res venetas, graecas atque levantis illustrantia a 1330–1454*, 2 vols., Venice, 1890–9.
- Timurtaş, F. K., *Şeyhî ve Husrev ü Şîrin'i (İnceleme – Metin)*, Istanbul, 1980.
- Şeyhî'nin Harnâme'si*, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1981.
- Todorov, Nikolai and Boris Nedkov, *Fontes Turcici Historiae Bulgaricae*, series XV–XVI, vol. XIII/II, Sofia, 1966.
- Toniolo, Paola Piana, *Notai genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Chio da Gregorio Panissaro (1403–1405)*, Genoa, 1995.
- Topaloğlu, A., *Muhammed b. Hamza, XV. Yüzyıl Başlarında Yapılmış 'Satır Arası' Kur'an Tercümesi*, vol. I, Istanbul, 1976.
- Turan, Osman, *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmi Vesikalar. Metin, Tercüme, Araştırmalar*, Ankara, 1988.
- (ed.), *Tarihi Takvimler*, Ankara, 1954.
- Turski Izvori za Bălgarskata Istoriija, Sofia, 1959–.
- Tursun Bey, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror by Tursun Beg*, ed. Halil İnalçık and Rhoads Murphey, Minneapolis and Chicago, 1978.
- Târîh-i Ebü'l-Feth*, ed. Mertol Tulum, Istanbul, 1977.
- Ülken, F., 'Elvân-ı Şîrâzî'nin Gülşen-i Râz Tercümesi (İnceleme-Metin)', doctoral thesis, Ege University, 2002.
- al-'Umari, 'Notice de l'ouvrage qui a pour titre Masalek alabsar fi memalek alamsar, Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées (ms. arabe 583)', tr. E. Quatremère, in *Notices et extraits des mss. de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, vol. XIII, Paris, 1838, pp. 334–81.
- Al-'Umari's Bericht über Anatolien in seinem Werke Masâlik al-absâr fî mamâlik al-amsâr*, I: Text, ed. Franz Taeschner, Leipzig, 1929.
- Vassaf Shirazi, *Tajziyat al-amsar wa tazjiyat al-a'sar*, ed. M. M. Isfahani, lith., Bombay, 1269/1853.
- Veled Çelebi, *Şeyh Mes'ûd Bin Osman, Ferheng-Nâme-i Sa'dî Tercümesi*, tr. Kilisli Muallim Rifat, Istanbul, AH 1340–2.
- Vilâyetnâme, Manakıb-ı Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli*, ed. A. Gölpınarlı, Istanbul, 1958.

Bibliography

- Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral, 2 vols., Paris, 1939, repr. 1961.
- Vranousis, L. I. (ed.), *Chronicle of Ioannina*, in *Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου* 12 (1962), 57–115.
- William of Rubruck, *The Journey of William Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World 1253–55*, tr. and ed. William Woodville Rockhill, London, 1900.
- The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck. His Journey to the Court of the Great Khan Mönke, 1253–1255*, eds. Peter Jackson and David Morgan, London, 1990.
- William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds done beyond the Sea*, 2 vols., tr. Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey, New York, 1943.
- Şeyhoğlu, Kenzû'l-Küberâ ve Mehekkü'l-Ulemâ (*İnceleme-Metin-İndeks*), Ankara, 1991.
- Yelten, M., *Şirvanlı Mahmud, Târîh-i İbn-i Kesîr Tercümesi (Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük)*, Ankara, 1998.
- Yoldaş, K., 'Tutmacı'nın Gül ü Hüsvrev'i: (İnceleme-Metin)', doctoral thesis, İnönü University, Malatya, 1998.
- al-Yunini, *Dhayl Mir'at al-zaman fî ta'rikh al-a'yan*, 4 vols., Hyderabad, 1954–61.
- Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yunini's Dhayl Mir'at al-zaman*, ed. and tr. Li Guo, 2 vols., Leiden, 1998.
- Yunus Emre, *Yunus Emre Divanı I (İnceleme), II (Tenkitli Metin), III (Risâletü'n-Nushiyye – Tenkitli Metin)*, ed. M. Tatçı, Ankara, 1990.
- Yunus Emre, Risalat al-Nushiyya ve Divan*, ed. A. Gölpınarlı, Istanbul, 1965.
- Yusuf-ı Meddâh, *Varka ve Gülşah: A. Fourteenth Century Anatolian Turkish Mesnevi*, ed. by G. Martin Smith, Leiden, 1976.
- Zibaldone da Canal, *Merchant Culture in Fourteenth Century Venice. The Zibaldone da Canal*, tr. John E. Dotson, New York, 1994.
- Zibaldone da Canal, manoscritto mercantile del sec. XIV*, ed. A. Stussi, Venice, 1967.
- Zonaras, Joannes, *Epitomae Historiarum*, vol. III, ed. T. Büttner-Wöbst, Bonn, 1897.
- Zucchello, Pignol, *Lettere di mercanti a Pignol Zucchello (1336–1350)*, ed. Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca, Venice, 1957.

Secondary sources

- Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, London and Costa Mesa, 1985–.
- The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, ed. H. A. R. Gibb et al., Leiden, 1960–2006 (abbreviated as *El2*).
- İslam Ansiklopedisi, İslâm Âlemi Coğrafya, Etnoğrafya ve Biyografya Lügatı*, ed. Adnan Adıvar et al., Istanbul, 1940–88 (abbreviated as *İA*).
- Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, ed. Ahmed Topaloğlu et al., Istanbul, 1988– (abbreviated as *TDVİA*).
- Afî, A. E., *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Dîn Ibnul Arabî*, Cambridge, 1939.
- Agacanov, S. Grigorevic, *Oğuzlar*, tr. from Russian by N. Ekber and A. Annaberdiyev, Istanbul, 2002.
- Ágoston, Gábor, *Guns for the Sultan: Military Power and the Weapons Industry in the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge, 2005.

Bibliography

- “‘The Most Powerful Empire’: Ottoman Flexibility and Military Might’, in *Empires and Superpowers: Their Rise and Fall*, ed. George Zimmar and David Hicks, Washington, D.C., 2005, pp. 127–66.
- ‘Ottoman Warfare in Europe 1453–1826’, in *European Warfare 1453–1815*, ed. Jeremy Black, London, 1999, pp. 118–44, 262–3.
- Ahmed, S. S., *The Yazidis: Their Life and Beliefs*, ed. Henri Field, Miami, 1975.
- Ahrweiler, H., *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre. La politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles*, Paris, 1966.
- ‘L’expérience nicéenne’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975), 23–40.
- ‘L’histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081–1317)’, *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 1–105.
- ‘Recherches sur la société byzantine au XIe siècle’, *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976), 99–124.
- Aigle, D., *Le Fars sous la domination mongole. Politique et fiscalité (XIIIe–XIVe s.)*, Paris, 2005.
- (ed.), *L’Iran face à la domination mongole*, Paris and Tehran, 1997.
- Akar, Metin, ‘Şeyyad Hazma Hakkında Yeni Bilgiler’, *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2 (1987), 1–14.
- Akdağ, M., *Türkiye’nin İktisadî ve İçtimai Tarihi*, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1971–4.
- Akdoğan, Yaşar, ‘Mi’rac, Mi’racnâme ve Ahmedî’nin Bilinmeyen Mi’racnâme’si’, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 9 (1989), 263–310.
- Akın, Himmet, *Aydınöğulları Tarihi Hakkında bir Araştırma*, Ankara, 1968.
- Akkaya, Ş., ‘Kitab-i Melik Danişmend Gazi: Eine türkische historischer Heldenroman aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts’, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Congress of Orientalists*, Leiden, 1957, pp. 432–5.
- Akok, Mahmut, ‘Hacıbektaş Veli Mimarî Manzumesi’, *Türk Etnografya Dergisi* 10 (1966), 27–58.
- ‘Kastamonu’nun Kasaba Köyünde Candaroğlu Mahmut Bey Camii’, *Belleten* 10 (1946), 293–301.
- Aksan, Virginia, ‘Ottoman War and Warfare 1453–1812’, in *War in the Early Modern World*, ed. Jeremy Black, Boulder, 1999, pp. 147–75.
- Akтуğ-Kolay, İlknur, *Batı Anadolu 14. Yüzyıl Beylikler Mimarisinde Yapım Teknikleri*, Ankara, 1999.
- Akurgal, Ekrem (ed.), *The Art and Architecture of Turkey*, New York, 1980.
- Album, S., ‘Studies in Mongol History and Numismatics I: Late Ilhanid Hoard (743/1342)’, *Studia Iranica* 13, 1 (1984), 49–116.
- ‘Studies in Mongol History and Numismatics II: a Late Ilhanid Hoard (741/1340) as Evidence for the History of Diyar Bakr’, *Studia Iranica* 14, 1 (1985), 43–76.
- Alexandru-Dersca, Marie-Mathilde, *La campagne de Timur en Anatolie*, London, 1982.
- Allan, J. S., ‘From Tabrîz to Siirt – Relocation of a Thirteenth-Century Metalworking School’, *Iran* 16 (1978), 182–93.
- Allouche, Adel, ‘Tegüder’s Ultimatum to Qalawun’, *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 22 (1990), 437–46.
- Alparslan, Ali, ‘Ahmedî’nin Yeni Bulunan Bir Eseri Mirkat-ı Edeb’, *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 10 (1960), 35–40.
- Altun, Ara, *Mardin’de Türk Devri Mimarisi*, Istanbul, 1971.

- 'Yarhisar, İlyas Bey Köyü Camisi ve Hamamı için Kısa Notlar,' *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 9–10 (1979–80), 29–52.
- Amitai, R., 'The Conversion of Tegüder Ilkhan to Islam', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 25 (2001), 41–50.
- Amitai-Preiss, R., *Mongols and Mamluks: the Mamluk–Ilkhanid War, 1260–1281*, Cambridge, 1995.
- Amitai-Preiss, R. and D. O. Morgan (eds.), *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, Leiden, 1999.
- Anadolu'da ve Rumeli'de Yörükler ve Türkmenler (Sempozyum Bildirileri, Tarsus 13–14 Mayıs), Ankara, 2000.
- Androudis, Paschalis, 'Historical and Archaeological Evidence on the Great Karacan-Saray (Büyük Kervansarayı) of Thessaloniki', *Makedoniká* 35 (2005–6), 63–97.
- Angelov, D., 'Certaines aspects de la conquête des peuples balkaniques par les Turcs', *Byzantino-Slavica* 17 (1956), 220–75.
- Anhegger, Robert, 'Beiträge zur frühosmanischen Baugeschichte', in *Zeki Velidî Togan'a Armağan*, İstanbul, 1950–5, pp. 301–30.
- 'Beiträge zur osmanischen Baugeschichte II, 1, Die Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne und die Ulu Cami in Manisa', *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 8 (1958), 40–56.
- Antoche, Emanuel Constantin, 'Les expéditions de Nicopolis (1396) et de Varna (1444): une comparaison', *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 4, 1–2 (2000), 28–74.
- 'Du tábor de Jan Žižka et de Jean Hunyadi au *tabur çengi* des armées ottomanes. L'art militaire hussite en Europe orientale, au Proche et au Moyen Orient (XVe–XVIIIe siècles)', *Turcica* 36 (2004), 91–124.
- Arat, Reşid Rahmeti, 'Anadolu Yazı Dilinin Tarihi İnkişafına Dair', in *Makaleler*, ed. Osman F. Sertkaya, Ankara, 1989.
- Arel, Ayda, 'Architecture and the Turkmen Emirates of the Aegean Area: a General Appraisal,' 9. Milletlararası Türk Sanatları Kongresi, 23–27 Eylül 1991, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi – İstanbul: Bildiriler, Ankara, 1995, pp. 163–72.
- 'Batı Anadolu'dan Birkaç Yapının Tarihlendirilmesi ve XV. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Mimarisi hakkında (On Dating Some Buildings in Western Anatolia: a Stylistic Definition of 15th Century Ottoman Architecture)', *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 2 (1970), 82–96.
- 'Menteşe Beyliği Devrinde Peçin Şehri (Peçin: a Capital of the Principality of Menteshe)', *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 1 (1968), 69–102.
- 'Üç Şerefeli Cami ve Osmanlı Mimarisinde Tipolojik Sınıflandırma Sorunu', *Mimarlık* 116 (1973), 17–20.
- Arel, Mehlika, 'Mut'taki Karamanoğulları Devri Eserleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 5 (1962), 241–50.
- Argenti, Philip R., *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the Island, 1346–1566*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1958.
- Arik, M. Oluş, *Bitlis Yapılarında Selçuklu Rönesansı*, Ankara, 1971.
- 'Erken Devir Anadolu Türk Mimarisinde Türbe Biçimleri ("Türbe" Forms in Early Anatolian Turkish Architecture)', *Anadolu (Anatolia)* 11 (1967), 57–119.
- 'Turkish Architecture in Asia Minor in the Period of the Emirates', in *The Art and Architecture of Turkey*, ed. Ekrem Akurgal, New York, 1980, pp. 111–37.
- Arik, R., 'Erzurum'da İki Cami', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 8 (1969), 149–60.
- Arıkan, Muzaffer, 'Yaya ve Müsellemlerde Toprak Tasarrufu', in *Atatürk Konferansları VIII. 1975–1976*, Ankara, 1983; 175–201.
- Arıkan, Zeki, XV–XVI. Yüzyıllarda Hamit Sancağı, İzmir, 1988.

- Arnakis, G. G., 'Futuvva Tradition in the Ottoman Empire: Ahis, Bektashi Derviches and Craftsmen', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12 (1953), 232-56.
- Oi πρώτοι Ὀθωμανοί*, Athens, 1947.
- Arseven, Celâl Esad, *Türk Sanatı Tarihi*, Istanbul, n.d.
- Arslan, H. Çetin, *Türk Akıncı Beyleri ve Balkanların İmarına Katkıları (1300-1451)*, Ankara, 2001.
- Artuk, İbrahim, 'Early Ottoman Coins of Orhan Ghazi as Confirmation of his Sovereignty', in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History: Studies in Honor of George C. Miles*, ed. Dickran K. Kouymjian, Beirut, 1974, pp. 457-63.
- 'Karesi-oğulları Adına Basılmış Olan İki Sikke', *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* 33 (1980/1), 283-9.
- 'Murad'ın Sikkelerine Genel bir Bakış, 761-792 (1359-1389)', *Belleten* 184 (1982), 787-93.
- 'Osmanlı Beyliğinin Kurucusu Osman Gazi'ye Ait Sikke', in *Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi (1071-1920) (Social and Economic History of Turkey (1071-1920))*, Birinci Uluslararası Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Kongresi Tebliğleri (Papers Presented to the First International Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey), Hacettepe University, Ankara, July 11-13, 1977, ed. Osman Okyar and Halil İnalçık, Ankara, 1980, pp. 27-33.
- Ashtor, E., *A Social and Economic History of the Near East in the Middle Ages*, London, 1976.
- Aslanapa, Oktay, '1970 Temmuz Van Ulu Camii Kazısı', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 4 (1970-1), 1-16.
- Anadolu'da Türk Çini ve Keramik Sanatı*, Istanbul, 1965.
- 'Ein anatolischer Tierteppich vom Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts', in *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens: In Memoriam Ernst Diez*, ed. Oktay Aslanapa, Istanbul, 1963, pp. 173-83.
- 'Doğu Anadolu'da Karakoyunlu Türbeleri', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yıllık Araştırmalar Dergisi* 1 (1956), 105-13.
- Edirne'de Osmanlı Devri Abideleri*, Istanbul, 1949.
- 'İznik Kazılarda Ele Geçen Keramikler ve Çini Fırınları', *Türk San'atı Tarihi Araştırma ve İncelemeleri* 2 (1969), 62-73.
- 'İznik'te Sultan Orhan İmâret Camii Kazısı', *Sanat Tarih Yıllığı* 1 (1964-5), 16-38.
- 'Kalehisar'da Bulunan Mimari Eserler', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 2 (1966-8), 1-14.
- Osmanlı Devri Mimarisi, Orhan Gaziden Başlıyarak Sonuna Kadar Padişahlara Göre Gelişmesi*, Istanbul, 1986.
- Osmanlılar Devrinde Kütahya Çinileri*, Istanbul, 1949.
- 'Pottery and Kilns from the Iznik Excavations', in *Forschungen zur Kunst Asiens: In Memoriam Kurt Erdmann*, Istanbul, 1969, pp. 140-6.
- Türk Sanatı*, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1973.
- Türkische Fliesen und Keramik in Anatolien*, Istanbul, 1965.
- Turkish Art and Architecture*, New York, 1971.
- 'Turkish Ceramics', *Archaeology* 24 (1971), 209-19.
- 'Turkish Pottery from the Iznik Excavations', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 59 (1997), 187-202.
- (ed.), *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens: In Memoriam Ernst Diez*, Istanbul, 1963.
- Aslanoglu, İnci, *Ankara Karacabey Külliyesi*, Ankara, 1988.
- Tire'de Camiler ve Üç Mescit*, Ankara, 1978.
- Atabinen, Rechid Safvet, *Les apports Turcs dans le peuplement et la civilisation de l'Europe orientale*, Paris and Istanbul, 1951.
- Atan, Turhan, *Türk Gümrük Tarihi. I. Cilt. Başlangıçtan Osmanlı Devletine Kadar*, Ankara, 1990.

- Atasoy, Nurhan and Julian Raby, *İpek: The Crescent and the Rose: Imperial Ottoman Silks and Velvets*, London, 2001.
- İznik: *The Pottery of Ottoman Turkey*, London and New York, 1989.
- Ateş, A., 'Burdur – Antalya ve Havalisi Kütüphanelerinde Bulunan Türkçe, Arapça ve Farsça Bazı Mühim Eserler', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 2, 3–4 (1948), 171–91.
- 'Hicrî VI–VIII. (XII–XIV.) Asırlarda Anadolu'da Farsça Eserler', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 7–8, 2 (1948), 94–135.
- Atıl, Esin, 'The Art of the Book', in *Turkish Art*, ed. Esin Atıl, Washington, DC, 1980, pp. 136–238.
- 'Turkish Miniature Painting under Sultan Mehmed II', *Ars Orientalis* 9 (1973), 103–20. (ed.), *Turkish Art*, Washington, DC, 1980.
- Atiya, Aziz S., *The Crusade of Nicopolis*, London, 1934.
- Aubin, J., *Émirs mongols et vizirs persans dans les remous de l'acculturation*, Paris, 1995.
- 'La politique orientale de Selim Ier', *Res Orientalis: Itinéraire d'Orient (Hommage à Claude Cahen)* 6 (1994), 197–216.
- 'La politique religieuse des Safavides', in *Le Shiisme Imamite*, Paris, 1971, pp. 236–43.
- 'Le *quriltai* de Sultan-Maydan (1336)', *Journal Asiatique* 276 (1991), 175–9.
- Ayan, Hüseyin, *Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, Hurşid-Nâme (Hürşid ü Ferahşâd)*, Erzurum, 1979.
- Aydın, M., 'Yazidiler ve İnanc Esasları', *Belleten* 52 (1988), 923–53.
- Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakkı, *Fâtih Devri Hattatları ve Hat Sanatı*, İstanbul, 1953.
- Osmanlı Mimârisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri 806–855 (1403–1451)*, İstanbul, 1972.
- Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri 630–805 (1230–1402)*, İstanbul, 1966.
- 'Le premier siècle de l'architecture ottomane', in *First International Congress of Turkish Art, Communications*, Ankara, 1961, pp. 47–61.
- Azamat, Nihat, 'II. Murad Devri Kültür Hayatı', unpublished doctoral thesis, Marmara University, 1996.
- Babinger, Franz, *Aufsätze und Anhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, 2 vols., Munich, 1962.
- Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.–15. Jahrhundert)*, Brno, Munich and Vienna, 1944.
- 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geschlechtes der Malkoç-oglu's', in Franz Babinger, *Aufsätze und Anhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, vol. I (Munich, 1962), pp. 355–90.
- 'Der Islam In Kleinasien: neue Wege der Islamforschung', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 76 (1922), 126–52.
- Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*, tr. Ralph Manheim, Princeton, 1978.
- 'A proposito delle coniazioni d'oro ottomane nel XV secolo sotto Murad II e Maometto II', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze* 5th ser. 5, 59 (1957), 90–4.
- Bakrer, Ömür, 'Mihrabs in Anatolia, Late 12th to Late 14th Centuries', in *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, ed. Géza Fehér, Budapest, 1978, pp. 125–46.
- Onüç ve Ondördüncü Yüzyıllarda Anadolu Mihrapları*, Ankara, 1976.
- 'Ornamental Brick Bonds in Anatolian Selçuk Architecture', in *IV. Internationaler Kongress für Türkische Kunst, München, 3.–7. September 1979, Kurzfassungen der Kongressreferate*, n.p., n.d., II.
- 'Ürgüp'ün Damsa Köyü'ndeki Taşkın Paşa Camii'nin Ahşap Mihrabı', *Belleten* 35 (1971), 367–82.

- Bakirtsis, Charalambos and Pantelis Xidas, 'İmaret. Komotini, Greece', in *Secular Medieval Architecture in the Balkans, 1300–1500, and its Preservation*, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjitrifonou, Thessalonike, 1997.
- Balard, Michel, *La Romanie génoise (XIIe–début du XVe siècle)*, 2 vols., Genoa and Paris, 1978.
- Balard, Michel, Angeliki E. Laiou and C. Otten-Froux, *Les Italiens à Byzance: édition et présentation de documents*, Paris, 1987.
- Balim-Harding, Çiğdem and Colin Imber (eds.), *The Balance of Truth: Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, Istanbul, 2000.
- Balivet, M., 'Byzantins judäisants et juifs islamisés', *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 24–41.
- 'Derviches Turcs en Roumanie latin: quelques remarques sur la circulation des idées religieuses au XVème siècle', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 11 (1987), 239–55.
- Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans Ottomans: vie de Cheikh Bedreddin, le 'Hallaj des Turcs' (1358/59–1416)*, Istanbul, 1995.
- Pour une concorde Islamo-Chrétien: démarches Byzantines et Latines à la fin du moyen-âge*, Rome, 1997.
- Roumanie Byzance et Pays de Rûm: histoire d'un espace d'imbrication Gréco-Turque*, Istanbul, 1994.
- Les Turcs au moyen-âge: des croisades aux Ottomans*, Istanbul, 2002.
- Balta, Evangelia, *Les vakıfs de Serrès et sa région (XVe–XVIe s.)*, Athens, 1995.
- Banguoğlu, Tahsin, *AltOsmanische Sprachstudien Zu Suheyl u NevBahâr*, Breslau, 1938.
- 'Kaşgarî'den Notlar II: Oğuzlar ve Oğuzeli Üzerine', *TDAY Belleten* (1959), 1–26.
- 'Kaşgarî'den Notlar III: Oğuzlar Lehçesi Üzerine', *TDAY Belleten* (1960), 23–48.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, 'Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları', *Belgeler* 1, 2 (1964), 235–377.
- 'Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire Ottoman aux XVe et XVIe siècles', *Journal of the Social and Economic History of the Orient* 1, 1 (1958), 9–36.
- 'İstîlâ Devrinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), 279–386.
- 'Osmanlı Devrinin 'Eşkıncülü Mülkler'i Veya 'Mülk Timarlar'ı Hakkında Notlar', in 60. *Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Togan'a Armağan*, Istanbul, 1950–5, pp. 61–70; republished in Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Türkiye'de Toprak Meselesi. Toplu Eserler* 1, Istanbul, 1980, pp. 897–904.
- 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, 1–4 (1949–50), 524–570; 13, 1–4 (1951–2), 56–78; 15, 1–4 (1953–4), 209–37.
- 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. Michael Cook, London, 1970, pp. 163–71.
- 'Tarihi Demografi Araştırmaları ve Osmanlı Tarihi', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 10 (1961), 1–27.
- 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve Arazi Tahrirleri ve Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 2, 1 (1940), 20–59.
- 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve Arazi Tahrirleri ve Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 2, 2 (1941), 214–47.
- Türkiye'de Toprak Meselesi. Toplu Eserler* 1, Istanbul, 1980.
- XV ve XVI üncü Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları. Kanunlar*, Istanbul, 1943.

- Barker, J. W., *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): a Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*, New Brunswick, 1968.
- Barrucand, Marianne, 'À propos des étapes de la décoration de l'Iskender-Name d'Ahmedi de 1416 (BNF ms. Turc 309)', *Damaszener Mitteilungen* 11 (2000), 25–36.
- Barthold, V., *Orta Asya Türk Tarihi Hakkında Dersler*, Istanbul, 1927.
- Barthold, V. and M. J. Rogers, 'Burial Rites of Turks and Mongols', *Central Asian Journal* 19 (1970), 195–227.
- Bartusis, Mark C., *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204–1453*, Philadelphia, 1992.
- Batur, Afife, 'Osmanlı Camilerinde Almaşık Duvar Üzerine (On the Walls Constructed Alternately [of Brick and Stone] in Ottoman Mosques)', *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 2 (1970), 134–227.
- Batur, Muzaffer, 'Beyşehirde Eşrefoğullarına ait Ağaç Oyma Pencere Kapakları Hakkında,' *Arkitekt* (1949), 199–201.
- Bayçarov, S. Ya., *Avrupa'nın Eski Türk Runik Abideleri*, Ankara, 1996.
- Baykal, Kâzım, *Bursa ve Anıtları: Osmanlı Devri*, 2nd edn, Istanbul, 1982.
- Bursa'da Ulu Câmi*, Istanbul, 1950.
- Baykara, Tuncer, *Türkiye Selçukluları Devrinde Konya*, Ankara, 1985.
- 'Türkiye Selçukluları'nda Şehir/Kent ve Şehirliler/Kentliler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Yaşar Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 275–92.
- Bayram, Mikail, *Ahi Evren ve Ahi Teşkilatının Kuruluşu*, Konya, 1991.
- Beattie, May H., 'Some Rugs of the Konya Region', *Oriental Art* 22 (1976), 60–76.
- Bedir, Murteza, 'Osmanlı Öncesi Türk Hukuk Tarihi Yazıcılığı', *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 3, 5 (2005), 27–85.
- Bees, N., 'Zur Schriftstellerei des Antonios von Larissa', *Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher* 12 (1936), 300–19.
- Beldiceanu, Nicoară, 'La région de Timok–Morava dans les documents de Mehmed II et de Selîm I', *Revue des Études Roumaines* 3–4 (1957), 111–29.
- 'Les Roumains à la bataille d'Ankara', *Südost-Forschungen* 14, 2 (1955), 441–50.
- Le timar dans l'état ottoman (début XIVe–début XVIe siècle)*, Wiesbaden, 1980.
- 'Les Valaques de Bosnie à la fin du XVe siècle et leurs institutions', *Turcica* 7 (1975), 122–34.
- Beldiceanu, Nicoară and Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Deux villes de l'Anatolie préottomane: Develi et Qarahisar d'après des documents inédits*, Paris, 1973.
- 'Quatre actes de Mehmed II concernant les Valaques des Balkans slaves', *Südost-Forschungen* 24 (1955), 103–18.
- Beldiceanu, Nicoară and P. S. Năsturel, 'La Thessalie entre 1454/55 et 1506', *Byzantion* 53, 1 (1983), 104–56.
- Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène, 'Analyse de la titulature d'Orhan sur deux inscriptions de Brousse', *Turcica* 34 (2002), 223–40.
- 'La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: la pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomans', *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 439–61.
- 'La conquête de la Bithynie maritime, étape décisive dans la fondation de l'état ottoman', in *Byzanz als Raum*, ed. Klaus Belke, Fridrich Bild, Johannes Koder and Peter Soustal, Vienna, 2000, pp. 21–35.
- 'L'installation des Ottomans', *La Bithynie au moyen âge*, ed. Bernard Geyer and Jacques Lefort, Paris, 2003, pp. 351–74.

- 'En marge d'un acte concernant le pengyek et les aqıngı', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 37 (1969), 21–48.
- Recherches sur les actes de règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I*, Munich, 1967.
- 'Seyyid 'Ali Sultan d'après les registres ottomans. L'installation de l'Islam hétérodoxe en Thrace', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule 1380–1699: Halcyon Days in Crete II*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1996, pp. 45–66.
- Belke, Klaus, Fridrich Bild, Johannes Koder and Peter Soustal (eds.), *Byzanz als Raum*, Vienna, 2000.
- Bemus-Taylor, M., 'Le décor du "Complexe vert" à Bursa, reflet de l'art timouride', *Cahiers d'Asie Centrale* 3–4 (1997), 251–66.
- Bendall, S. and C. Morrison, 'Un trésor de ducats d'imitation au nom d'Andrea Dandolo (1343–1354)', *Revue Numismatique*, 6th series, 21 (1979), 176–93.
- Bennasar, B. and L., *Les Chrétiens d'Allah: l'histoire extraordinaire des renégats (XVIe et XVIIe siècles)*, Paris, 1989.
- Berchem, Max van and Halil Edhem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum arabicarum, troisième partie, Asie Mineure, tome premier – Siwas, Diwrigi*, Cairo, 1917.
- Bertelé, T., 'I gioielli della corona bizantina dati in pegno alla Repubblica Veneta nel sec. XIV e Mastino II della Scala', in *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*, vol. II (Milan, 1962), pp. 89–177.
- 'L'iperpero bizantino dal 1261 al 1450', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini*, 5th series 5, 59 (1957), 70–89.
- Beševliev, V., *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1963.
- Beylié, L. de, *L'habitation byzantine*, Grenoble and Paris, 1902.
- Birge, J. K., *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, Hartford, Conn., 1937.
- Birnbaum, Henrik and Speros Vryonis Jr. (eds.), *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969*, The Hague, 1972.
- Black, Jeremy, *War and the World: Military Power and the Fate of Continents 1450–2000*, New Haven and London, 2000.
- Blair, S., 'The Coins of the Later Ilkhānids: Mint Organization, Regionalization, and Urbanism', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 27 (1982), 211–30.
- Blake, Robert P., 'The Circulation of Silver in the Moslem East down to the Mongol Epoch', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1937), 291–328.
- Bode, Wilhelm von and Ernst Kühnel, *Antique Rugs from the Near East*, 4th edn, tr. Charles Grant Ellis, Ithaca, 1984.
- Bogdan, Damian P., 'Grafitele de la Basarabi (Murfatlar)', *Analei de Universității C. I. Parhon [Bucharest]* 16 (1961), 31–44.
- Bogojević, Lidija, 'Les turbés de Skopje', in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca, Venezia, 26–29 Settembre 1963*, Naples, 1965, pp. 31–39.
- Bojanić-Lukač, Dušanka, 'De la nature et de l'origine de l'ispendje', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1976), 9–30.
- Vidin i vidinskijat sandžak prez 15–16 vek*, Sofia, 1975.
- Bombaci, Alessio, 'The Army of the Saljuqs of Rūm', *Annali Istituto Oriente di Napoli* 38, 28 (1978), 343–69.
- Bon, A., *La Morée franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1969.

- Boogert, Maurits H. van den and Kate Fleet (eds.), *The Ottoman Capitulations: Text and Context*, *Oriente Moderno* 22, 3 (2003).
- Bostan, İdris, *Kürekli ve Yelkenli Osmanlı Gemileri*, Istanbul, 2005.
- Osmanlı Bahriye Teşkilâtı: XVII. Yüzyılda Tersâne-i Âmire*, Ankara, 1992.
- Bosworth, C. E., *The New Islamic Dynasties: a Chronological and Genealogical Manual*, Edinburgh, 1996.
- Boyle, J. A., 'Dynastic and Political History of the Il-Khans', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. V, ed. J. A. Boyle, Cambridge, 1968.
- (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. V, Cambridge, 1968.
- Brand, C. M., 'The Byzantines and Saladin, 1185–1192: Opponents of the Third Crusade', *Speculum* 37 (1962), 167–81.
- 'The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh–Twelfth Centuries', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 43 (1989), 1–25.
- Bratianu, G. I., 'Nouvelles contributions à l'étude de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople sous les Paléologues et les empereurs Ottomans', *Byzantion* 6 (1931), 641–56.
- 'La question de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et ottomane', *Byzantion* 5 (1929–30), 83–107.
- Braun, Maximilian, *Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarević von Konstantin dem Philosophen*, 's-Gravenhage, Wiesbaden, 1956.
- Brehier, L., 'La population rurale au IXe siècle d'après l'hagiographie byzantine', *Byzantion* 1 (1924), 177–90.
- Vie et mort de Byzance*, Paris, 1969.
- Brend, B., 'The Patronage of Fahr ad-Din 'Ali ibn al-Husain and the Work of Kaluk ibn 'Abd Allah in the Development of the Decoration of Portals in Thirteenth-Century Anatolia', *Kunst des Orients* 10, 1–2 (1975).
- Browne, E. G., *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. II, Cambridge, 1956.
- Browning, R., 'A Note on the Capture of Constantinople', *Byzantion* 22 (1952), 379–86.
- Bruinessen, M. van, 'Religion in Kurdistan', *Kurdish Times* 4 (1991), 1–27.
- Bryer, A., 'A Byzantine Family the Gabrades, c. 979–c. 1653', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1970), 164–87.
- 'The Grand Komnenos and the Great Khan at Karakorum in 1246', *Res Orientales* 6 (1994), 257–61.
- 'The Question of Byzantine Mines in the Pontos: Chalybian Iron, Chaldian Silver, Koloneian Alum and the Mummy of Cheriana', *Anatolian Studies* 32 (1982), 133–50.
- Bryer, Anthony and Heath Lowry (eds.), *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantium and Early Ottoman Society*, Birmingham and Washington, 1986.
- Buchon, J. A. C., *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1843.
- Buluç, Sadettin, 'Behcetü'l-Hadâ'ık Fî-Mev'izeti'l-Halâ'ık'den Örnekler', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 7, 1–2 (1956), 16–37.
- 'Behcetü'l-Hadâ'ık Fî-Mev'izeti'l-Halâ'ık'ten Derlenmiş Koşuklar', *TDAY Belleten* 1963 (1988), 161–201.
- 'Elvan Çelebi'nin Menâkıbnâmesi', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 19 (1989), 1–6.
- 'Şeyyad Hamza'nın Beş Manzumesi', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 7, 1–2 (1956), 1–16.
- 'Şeyyad Hamza'nın Bilinmeyen Bir Mesnevisi', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 15 (1969), 247–63.
- 'Şeyyad Hamza'nın Lirik Bir Şiiri', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 12 (1963), 139–42.
- Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, 3 vols., Istanbul, AH 1333.

- Büyükdigan, İlter, 'Tahtakale Hamam, Edirne, Turkey', in *Secular Medieval Architecture in the Balkans 1300–1500 and its Preservation*, ed. Sl. Curčić and E. Hadjistryphonos, Thessalonike, 1997, pp. 330–1.
- Caferoğlu, A., 'İlk Anadolu Vatan Kültürü Kurucuları', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 17 (1972), 1–12.
- Çağatay, Neşet, *Bir Türk Kurumu olan Ahilik*, Ankara, 1974.
- Çağman, Filiz (Öğütmen), 'Sultan Mehmed II Dönemine Ait Bir Minyatürlü Yazma Külliyyatı Katibi', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* (1974–5), 303–46.
- Çağman, Filiz and Zeren Tanındı, *The Topkapı Saray Museum: The Albums and Illustrated Manuscripts*, tr. and ed. J. M. Rogers, London, 1986.
- Cahen, Claude, 'La campagne de Mantzikert d'après les sources musulmanes', *Byzantion* 9 (1934), 613–42.
- 'Le commerce anatolien au début du XIIIe siècle', in *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halpen*, Paris, 1953, pp. 93–4.
- 'Contribution à l'histoire du Diyar Bakr au quatorzième siècle', *Journal Asiatique* 243 (1955), 65–100.
- 'Une famille byzantine au service des Seldjuqides d'Asie Mineure', *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth, Heidelberg, 1966, pp. 145–9.
- The Formation of Turkey*, ed. and tr. P. M. Holt, London, 2001.
- 'Notes pour l'histoire des Turcomans d'Asie Mineure au XIIIe siècle', *Journal Asiatique* 239 (1951), 335–54.
- Pre-Ottoman Turkey: a General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c.1071–1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams, London, 1968.
- 'La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure', *Byzantion* 18 (1948), 5–67.
- 'Les principautés turcomanes au début du XIVe siècle d'après Pachimère et Grégoras', *Tarih Dergisi (Mélanges İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı)* 39 (1979), III–16.
- 'Le problème ethnique en Anatolie', *Cahier d'Histoire Mondiale* 2 (1954–5), 347–62.
- 'Le problème du Shiisme dans l'Asie Mineure turque pré-ottomane', in *Le Shiisme Imamite (Colloque de Strasbourg 1968)*, Paris, 1970, pp. 115–29.
- 'Quelques textes négligés concernant les Turcomans de Rûm au moment de l'invasion mongole', *Byzantion* 14 (1939), 131–9.
- 'Reflexions sur le waqf ancien', *Studia Islamica* 14 (1961), 37–56.
- 'Sur les traces des premiers akhis', in *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, Istanbul, 1953, pp. 81–91.
- Turcobyzantina et Oriens Christianus*, London, 1974.
- La Turquie pré-ottomane*, Istanbul and Paris, 1988.
- Canard, M., 'Delhemma, Seyyid Battal et Omar al-No'man', *Byzantion* 12 (1937), 183–8.
- Canpolat, Mustafa, 'Behcetü'l-Hadâ'ık'ın Dili Üzerine', *TDAY Belleten* 1967 (1989), 165–75.
- Ömer bin Mezîd Mecmû'atü'n-Nezâ'ir, Ankara, 1982.
- Canatay, Gönül, *Anadolu Selçuklu ve Osmanlı Darüşşifaları*, Ankara, 1992.
- Carile, A., 'Partitio terrarum Imperii Romaniae', *Studi Veneziani* 7 (1965), 125–305.
- Carswell, John, 'Six Tiles', in *Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, ed. Richard Ettinghausen, New York, 1972, pp. 99–124.
- Kütahya Tiles and Pottery from the Armenian Cathedral of St James, Jerusalem*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1972.
- 'Some Fifteenth-Century Hexagonal Tiles from the Near East', *Victoria and Albert Museum Yearbook* 3 (1972), 59–75.

Bibliography

- Carswell, John and C. J. F. Dowsett, 'Ceramics', in *Tulips, Arabesques and Turbans: Decorative Arts from the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Yanni Petsopoulos, New York, 1982, pp. 73–114.
- Çavuşoğlu, M., 'Fatih Sultan Mehmed Devrine Kadar Osmanlı-Türk Edebî Mahsullerinde Muhtevânın Tekâmülü', *Kubbealtı Akademi Mecmuası* 11, 2 (1982), 31–43.
- Çelebioğlu, Âmil, *Türk Edebiyatı'nda Mesnevi (XV. Yüzyıla Kadar)*, Istanbul, 1999.
- Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed, *Muhammediye I–II*, Istanbul, 1996.
- Cessi, R., 'Venezia e l'acquisto di Nauplia ed Argo', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, n.s. 30 (1915), 147–73.
- Çetin, İ., *Tursun Fakih Hayatı, Edebî Şahsiyeti, Mesnevîleri*, Ankara, 2002.
- Çetin, N., 'Ahmedî'nin Bilinmeyen Birkaç Eseri', *Tarih Dergisi* 2, 3–4 (1952), 103–8.
- Çetin, O., *Selçuklu Müesseseleri ve Anadolu'da İslâmiyet'in Yayılışı*, Istanbul, 1981.
- Sicillere Göre Bursa'da İhtidâ Hareketleri ve Sosyal Sonuçları (1472–1909)* (Ankara, 1994).
- Çetintaş, Sedat, *Türk Mimari Anıtları, Osmanlı Devri. Bursa'da İlk Eserler*, Istanbul, 1946.
- Türk Mimari Anıtları, Osmanlı Devri, Bursa'da Murad I ve Bayezid I Binaları*, Istanbul, 1952.
- Cezar, Mustafa, *Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical Period and the Ottoman Construction System*, Istanbul, 1983.
- Chalandon, P., *Les Comnènes, études sur l'empire byzantin aux XIe–XIIe siècles: Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel Comnène (1143–1180)*, Paris, 1912.
- Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ie Comnène*, Paris, 1900.
- Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, 2 vols., Paris, 1907.
- Charanis, P., 'The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century', in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. I, ed. K. Setton, Philadelphia, 1955, pp. 177–219.
- 'On the Date of the Occupation of Gallipoli by the Turks', *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955), 113–17.
- 'Economic Factors in the Decline of the Byzantine Empire', *The Journal of Economic History* 13 (1953), 412–24.
- 'Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959), 25–44.
- 'Internal Strife in Byzantium during the Fourteenth Century', *Byzantion* 15 (1940–1), 208–30.
- 'Piracy in the Aegean during the Reign of Michael VIII Palaeologos', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10 (1950), 127–36.
- Chittik, W. C., *Ibn Arabi's Metaphysics of Imagination: the Sûfi Path of Knowledge*, Albany, 1989.
- 'Sadr al-Dîn Kûnawî on the Oneness of Being', *International Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1981), 171–84.
- Chodkiewicz, M., *Un océan sans rivage*, Paris, 1992.
- 'Reception de la doctrine d'ibn 'Arabî dans le monde ottoman', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2005, pp. 97–122.
- Le sceau des saints; prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d'ibn Arabî*, Paris, 1986.
- Christensen, Stephen, 'The Heathen Order of Battle', in *Violence and the Absolutist State. Studies in European and Ottoman History*, ed. Stephen Christensen, Copenhagen, 1990, pp. 75–132.
- (ed.), *Violence and the Absolutist State: Studies in European and Ottoman History*, Copenhagen, 1990.

Bibliography

- Chrysostomides, J., 'John V Palaeologus in Venice (1370–1371) and the Chronicle of Carollo: a Reinterpretation', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31 (1965), 76–84.
- 'Studies on the Chronicle of Carollo with Special Reference to the History of Byzantium from 1370 to 1377', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), 123–82.
- 'Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 267–356.
- Clayer, N., *Mystiques, état et société: les Halvetis dans l'air balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours*, Leiden, 1994.
- Clayer, N. and A. Popovic, 'Les turques dans les Balkans à l'époque ottomane', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. Y. A. Ocak, Ankara, 2005, pp. 261–78.
- Clément, O., *Byzance et le Christianisme*, Paris, 1964.
- Cook, M. A. (ed.), *A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, Cambridge, 1976.
- (ed.), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*, London, 1970.
- Corbin, H., *L'homme de lumière dans le soufisme iranien*, Paris, 1971.
- L'imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d'ibn Arabî*, Paris, 1958.
- Cosmo, Nicola Di (ed.), *Warfare in Inner Asian History, 500–1800*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2002.
- Crane, Howard, 'Notes on Architecture and Patronage in Beylik Anatolia (1300–1450)', in *The Turks*, vol. II, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca, Ankara, 2002, pp. 737–45.
- Çulpan, Cevdet, *Türk-İslâm Tahta Oymacılık Sanatından Rahleler*, Istanbul, 1968.
- Cunbur, M., 'Gülşehri ve Mantıku't-Tayr'ı', doctoral thesis, Ankara University, 1952.
- Curčić, Sl. 'Architecture in the Age of Insecurity', in *Secular Architecture in the Balkans, 1300–1500*, ed. Sl. Curčić and E. Hadjistryphonos, Thessalonike, 1997, pp. 19–51.
- Curčić, Sl. and E. Hadjistryphonos (eds.), *Secular Architecture in the Balkans, 1300–1500*, Thessalonike, 1997.
- Daftary, F., *The Īsmā'īlīs: Their History and Doctrine*, Cambridge, 2001.
- Dagron, G., 'Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: l'immigration syrienne', *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976), 177–216.
- Dağtekin, Hüseyin, 'İstanbul'un Fethinde Kullanılan Yürükuleler', in *Fetihten Önce, Fetihten Sonra*, Istanbul, 2003, pp. 45–65.
- Daneshvari, Abbas (ed.), *Essays in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Katharina Otto-Dorn*, Malibu, 1981.
- Delilbaşı, Melek, 'Ortaçağ'da Türk Hükümdarlarının Ahidnamelerle Batılılara Verdikleri İmtiyazlara Genel bir Bakış', *Belleten* 47, 185 (1983), 95–103.
- 'Selanik ve Yanya'da Osmanlı Egemenliğinin Kurulması', *Belleten* 51, 199 (1987), 75–106.
- Demetriades, Vassilis, 'Some Thoughts on the Origins of the *Devşirme*', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1993, pp. 23–31.
- 'The Tomb of Ghazi Evrenos Bey at Yanitsa and its Inscription', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39 (1976), 328–32.
- Demiriz, Yıldız, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Süsleme, I, Erken Devir (1300–1453)*, Istanbul, 1979.
- Dendrinou, Charalambos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (eds.), *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, Aldershot, 2003.
- Dennis, G. T., *The Reign of Manuel II Paleologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387*, Rome, 1960.

- 'Three Reports from Crete on the Situation in Romania', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 243–65.
- Denny, Walter, 'Ceramics', in *Turkish Art*, ed. Esin Atıl, Washington, DC, 1980, pp. 241–97.
- 'Ottoman Turkish Textiles', *Textile Museum Journal* 3 (1972), 55–66.
- 'Textiles', in *Tulips, Arabesques and Turbans: Decorative Arts from the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Yanni Petsopoulos, New York, 1982, pp. 121–68.
- Deny, J., 'Sary Saltıq et le nom de la ville de Babadaghi', *Mélanges Emile Picot*, vol. II, Paris, 1913, pp. 1–15.
- Der Nersessian, S., 'The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia', in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. II, ed. K. M. Setton, Madison, 1969, pp. 630–59.
- Diaconu, P., *Les Petchénègues au Bas Danube*, Bucharest, 1979.
- Diez, Ernst, Oktay Aslanapa and Mahmud Mesut Koman, *Karaman Devri Sanatı*, Istanbul, 1950.
- Dijkema, F. Th., *The Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne*, Leiden, 1977.
- Dilçin, Cem, 'XIII. Yüzyıl Metinlerinden Yeni Bir Yapıt: Ahvâl-i Kıyâmet', in Ömer Asım Aksoy *Armağanı*, ed. Mustafa Canpolat, Semih Tezcan and Mustafa Şerif Onaran, Ankara, 1978, pp. 49–86.
- Dilçin, Dehri, *Şeyyad Hamza, Yûsuf ve Zeliha*, Istanbul, 1946.
- Dimand, M. S., *Oriental Rugs in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York, 1973.
- Dimitrov, Dimitir, *Prabâlgarite po Severnoto i Zapadnoto Černomorie*, Varna, 1987.
- Doğru, Halime, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Yaya-Müsellem-Taycı Teşkilâtı (XV. ve XVI. Yüzyılda Sultanönü Sancağı)*, Istanbul, 1990.
- Ducelier, A., *La façade maritime de l'Albanie au moyen âge: Durazzo et Valona du XIe au XVe siècle*, Thessalonike, 1981.
- Duffy, Christopher, *Siege Warfare: the Fortress in the Early Modern World 1494–1660*, London and New York, 1979.
- Durukian, Aynur, *Balat İlyas Bey Camii*, Ankara, 1988.
- Ehrenkreutz, Andrew S., 'Monetary Aspects of Medieval Near Eastern Economic History', in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*, ed. M. A. Cook, London, 1970, pp. 37–50.
- Ekrem, Mehmet Ali, 'Romanya'da Keşfedilen Orhun Yazısı Örnekleri', in *Balkanlar'da Türk Mührü*, ed. O. F. Sertkaya, Y. Kocasavaş, E. Çetin and Y. Tiryaki, Istanbul, 1998, pp. 69–75.
- Elezović, Gliša, 'Turski spomenici u Skoplju', *Glasnik Skopskog Naučnog Društva* 1 (1925), 136–76.
- 'Turski spomenici u Skoplju, III, zadužbine sultana Murata II', *Glasnik Skopskog Naučnog Društva* [Skopje] 3–4 (1928), 177–92.
- Ellis, Charles Grant, 'The Rugs from the Great Mosque of Divrik', *Halı* 1 (1978), 269–73.
- 'A Soumak-Woven Rug in a Fifteenth Century International Style', *Textile Museum Journal* 1 (1963), 5–7.
- Emecen, Feridun, M., 'A csata, amely a "Nagy Török" előtt megnyitotta a Magyar Alföldet', in *Mohács*, ed. János B. Szabó, Budapest, 2006, pp. 412–34.
- 'Gazaya Dair: XIV. Yüzyıl Kaynakları Arasında bir Gezinti', in *Prof. Dr. Hakkı Dursun Yıldız Armağanı*, Ankara, 1995, pp. 191–7.

- İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası, İstanbul, 2003.
- İstanbul'un Fethi Olayı ve Meseleleri, İstanbul, 2003.
- XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazası, Ankara, 1989.
- Emir, Sedat, *Erken Osmanlı Mimarlığında Çok-İşlevli Yapılar: Kentsel Kolonizasyon Yapıları Olarak Zaviyeler*, vol. I: Orhan Gazi Dönemi Yapıları; vol. II: Öncül Yapıları Tokat Zaviyeleri, İzmir, 1994.
- Emmert, Thomas A., *Serbian Golgotha: Kosovo, 1389*, New York, 1990.
- Emre, N., 'Aydinoğulları ve Eserleri', *Arkitekt* 10-12 (1973), 307-20.
- Ender, Celil, Üstün Erek and Gültekin Teoman, *Candaroğulları Beyliği (İsfendi-yaroğulları Beyliği) Paraları Kataloğu*, İstanbul, 2003.
- Ercan, Yavuz, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bulgarlar ve Voynuklar*, Ankara, 1986.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet B., *Türk Dili Tarihi*, Ankara, 2004.
- Erdmann, Kurt, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1961.
- The History of the Early Turkish Carpet*, tr. Robert Pinner, London, 1977.
- 'Neue Arbeiten zur Türkischen Keramik', *Ars Orientalis* 1 (1963), 192-219.
- 'Neue orientalische Tierteppiche auf abendländischen Bildern des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 63 (1941), 121-6.
- Oriental Carpets: an Account of Their History*, tr. Charles Grant Ellis, Fishguard, 1976.
- 'Orientalische Tierteppiche auf Bildern des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 50 (1929), 261-98.
- 'Seraybauten des Dreizehnten und Vierzehnten Jahrhunderts in Anatolien', *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959), 77-94.
- Seven Hundred Years of Oriental Carpets*, ed. Hanna Erdmann, tr. May H. Beattie and Hildegard Herzog, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970.
- 'Vorosmanische medresen und Imarets vom Medresentyp in Anatolien', in *Studies in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Professor K. A. C. Creswell*, ed. C. L. Geddes, Cairo, 1965, pp. 49-62.
- 'Zur türkischen Baukunst seldschukischer und osmanischer Zeit', *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 8 (1958), 1-39.
- Erdmann, Kurt and Hanna Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1961-76.
- Eren, Güler, Kemal Çiçek and Cem Oğuz (eds.), *Osmanlı*, 12 vols., Ankara, 1999.
- Ergin, O., 'Sadraddin el-Kunawî ve Eserleri', *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1957), 63-90.
- Erken, Sabih, 'Edirne Hamamları', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 10 (1973), 403-19.
- Ersoy, Bozkurt, *Bergama Camii ve Mescitleri*, Ankara, 1989.
- 'Bergama Ulu Camii', *Arkeoloji - Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* 4 (1988), 57-66.
- 'Bergama'da Parmaklı ve Lonca Mescitleri', *Arkeoloji - Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* 2 (1983), 38-49.
- Ertaylan, İsmail Hikmet, *Ahmed-i Dâ'î, Hayatı ve Eserleri*, İstanbul, 1952.
- Becetü'l-Hakâyık*, İstanbul, 1960.
- 'H. VII. (M. XIII.) Asra Ait Çok Değerli Bir Türk Dili Yâdigârı: *Behcetü'l-Hadâ'ık Fî-Mev'izeti'l-Halâ'ık*', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 3 (1949), 275-7.
- Tabiat-nâme*, İstanbul, 1960.
- Türk Edebiyatı Örnekleri I: Varaka ve Gülşah*, İstanbul, 1945.
- 'Yeni ve Değerli Bir Dil ve Edebiyat Belgesi: *Tarikat-nâme*', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 1, 3-4 (1946), 235-44.

Bibliography

- Yusuf İle Züleyha, İstanbul, 1960.
- ‘Yûsuf-î Meddâh, Yeni İki Varaka ve Gülşah Nûshası, Hâmûş-Nâme, Dâsitân-î İblîs ‘Aleyhi’-La’ne ve Maktel-i Hüseyin’, *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 1, 1 (1946), 105–21.
- Ethe, H., *Die Fahrten Des Sajjid Batthal*, Leipzig, 1871.
- Ettinghausen, Richard, ‘An Early Ottoman Textile’, *First International Congress of Turkish Art, Communications*, Ankara, 1961, pp. 134–43.
- ‘New Light on Early Animal Carpets’, in *Aus der Welt der islamischen Kunst. Festschrift für Ernst Kühnel*, ed. Richard Ettinghausen, Berlin, 1959, pp. 93–116.
- (ed.), *Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York, 1972.
- Eyice, Semavi, ‘Bursa’da Osman ve Orhan Gazi Türbeleri’, *Vakıflar Dergisi* 5 (1962), 131–47.
- ‘İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dinî-İçtimai bir Müessesesi: Zâviyeler ve Zâviyeli-Camiler’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 21, 1–2 (1962–3), 1–80.
- ‘İznik’de Büyük Hamam ve Osmanlı Devri Hamamları Hakkında bir Deneme’, *Tarih Dergisi* 2 (1960), 99–120.
- ‘Kaybolan bir Tarihî Eser Şeyh Murad Mescidi’, *Tarih Dergisi* 17 (1968), 111–30.
- ‘La Mosquee-zaviyah de Seyyid Mehmed à Yenişehir: Recherches sur l’architecture turque du XIVe. siècle’, in *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens: In Memoriam Ernst Diez*, ed. Oktay Aslanapa, İstanbul, 1963, pp. 49–68.
- ‘Quatre édifices mal connus’, *Cahiers Archéologiques* 10 (1959), 246–58.
- ‘Sofya Yakınında İhtiman’da Gazi Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey İmareti-Camii’, *Kubbealtı Akademi Mecmuası* 4, 2 (1975), 49–61.
- ‘Türk Mimarisinde Bedestanlar’, in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca, Venezia 26–29 Settembre 1963*, Naples, 1965, pp. 113–22.
- ‘Yunanistan’da Unutulmuş Eski Bir Türk Eseri’, *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi* 5 (1968), 67–73.
- Failler, A., ‘Chronologie et composition dans l’Histoire de Georges Pachymérès’, I: Livres I–III, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 38 (1980), 5–103; II: Livres III–VI, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 39 (1981), 145–249; III: Livres VII–XIII, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 48 (1990), 5–87.
- ‘Les emirs turcs à la conquête de l’Anatolie au début du 14e siècle’, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 52 (1994), 69–112.
- Faroqhi, S., *Der Bektaschi Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826)*, Vienna, 1980.
- Faure, M. C., ‘Le Dauphin Humbert II à Venise et en Orient, 1345–1347’, *Mélanges d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de l’École Française de Rome* 27 (1907), 509–62.
- Fazlıoğlu, İ., ‘Osmanlı Döneminde “Bilim” Alanındaki Türkçe Telif ve Tercüme Eserlerin Türkçe Oluş Nedenleri ve Bu Eserlerin Dil Bilincinin Oluşmasındaki Yeri ve Önemi’, *Kutadgubilig* 3 (2003), 151–84.
- Fehér, Géza (ed.), *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, Budapest, 1978.
- Ferit, M. and M. Mesut, *Selçuk Veziri Sahip Ata ve Oğullarının Hayatları ve Eserleri*, İstanbul, 1934.
- Fine, John, *The Late Medieval Balkans: a Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor, 1987.
- Finkel, Caroline, *Osman’s Dream*, New York, 2006.

Bibliography

- Firuzanfar, B., *Zindagani-i Mawlânâ Jalâl al-dîn Muhammad*, Tehran, AH 1354.
- Fleet, Kate, 'Appalto and Gabella: Farmed Tax or Monopoly?', *Eurasian Studies* 2, 1 (2003), 31–42.
- 'Caffa, Turkey and the Slave Trade: the Case of Battista Macio', in *Europa e Islam tra i secoli XIV e XVI Europe and Islam between 14th and 16th Centuries*, ed. Michele Bernardini, Clara Borrelli, Anna Cerbo and Encarnación Sánchez García, Naples, 2002, pp. 373–89.
- 'Corruption and Justice: the Case of Ettore di Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinis, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin, Aldershot, 2003, pp. 275–90.
- 'Dentro il "buco nero": la Turchia occidentale nel Trecento', *Quaderni di Storia* 52 (2000), 57–70.
- 'Early Ottoman Self Definition', in *Essays in Honour of Barbara Flemming*, ed. Jan Schmidt, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 26, 1 (2002), pp. 229–38.
- 'Early Turkish Naval Activities', in *The Ottomans and the Sea*, ed. Kate Fleet, *Oriente Moderno* 20 (81), 1 (2001), pp. 129–38.
- European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, Cambridge, 1999.
- 'Law and Trade in the Early 15th Century: the Case of Cagi Sati Oglu', in *The Ottomans and Trade*, ed. Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *Oriente Moderno* 26, 1 (2006), pp. 187–91.
- 'Osmanlı Topraklarında Latin Ticareti (XIV–XV. Yüzyıllar)', in *Osmanlı*, ed. Güler Eren, Kemal Çiçek and Cem Oğuz, 12 vols., Ankara, 1999, III, pp. 81–5.
- 'Ottoman Grain Exports from Western Anatolia at the End of the Fourteenth Century', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 40, 3 (1997), 283–93.
- 'Tax-farming in the Early Ottoman State', *The Medieval History Journal* 6, 2 (2003), 249–58.
- 'Turkish–Latin Diplomatic Relations in the 14th Century: the Case of the Consul', in *The Ottoman Capitulations: Text and Context*, ed. Maurits H. van den Boogert and Kate Fleet, *Oriente Moderno* 22, 3 (2003), pp. 605–11.
- 'Turkish–Latin Relations at the End of the Fourteenth Century', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 49, 1–2 (1996), 131–7.
- (ed). *The Ottomans and the Sea*, *Oriente Moderno* 20 (81), 1, 2001.
- Fleischer, Cornell H., *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the Historian Mustafa Ali (1541–1600)*, Princeton, 1986.
- Fletcher, Joseph, 'Turco-Mongolian Monarchic Tradition in the Ottoman Empire,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3–4 (1979–80), 236–51.
- Flemming, Barbara, 'Beylikler Devrinin Bir Romantik Mesnevisi: Fahrî'nin Husrev ü Şîrîn'i', in *I. Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi (İstanbul, 15–20.X.1973) Tebliğler*, vol. II: *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı*, İstanbul, 1979, pp. 325–9.
- Fahrîs Husrev u Şîrîn eine türkische Dichtung von 1367*, Wiesbaden, 1974.
- Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien und Lykien im Spätmittelalter*, Wiesbaden, 1964.
- Fodor, Pál, 'Aḥmedî's Dāsitān as a Source of Early Ottoman History', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 38, 1–2 (1984), 41–54.
- 'The Way of a Seljuq Institution to Hungary: the *Cerehôr*', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 38, 3 (1984), 367–99.

- Foss, Clive, 'The Defences of Asia Minor against the Turks', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 27 (1982), 145–205.
- Ephesus after Antiquity: a Late Antique, Byzantine and Turkish City*, Cambridge, 1979.
- Frauenholz, Eugen von, *Das Heerwesen der germanischen Frühzeit, des Frankenreiches und des ritterlichen Zeitalters (Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Heerwesens)*, vol. I, Munich, 1935.
- Froianov, Igor Iakovlevich, *Kiievskaiia Rus. Ocherki socialno-politicheskoi istorii*, Leningrad, 1980.
- Frye, R. N. and A. Sayılı, 'Selçuklular'dan evvel Orta Şark'ta Türkler', *Belleten* 10 (1946), 97–131.
- Gaborieau, M., A. Popovic and Th. Zarccone (eds.), *Naqshibandis: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman*, Istanbul and Paris, 1990.
- Gabriel, Albert, *Une capitale turque, Brousse, Bursa*, 2 vols., Paris, 1958.
- Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 2 vols., Paris, 1931–4.
- Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, Paris, 1940.
- Gadolin, Anitra R., 'Alexius Comnenus and the Venetian Trade Privileges: a New Interpretation', *Byzantion* 50 (1980), 439–46.
- Le Gall, D., *The Ottoman Naqshbandiyya in the Pre-Mujaddidi Phase*, Michigan, 1996.
- Gallotta, Aldo and Ugo Marazzi (eds.), *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, Naples, 1982.
- Gasparini, Elisabetta, *Le pitture murali della Muradiye de Edirne*, Padua, 1985.
- Geanakopoulou, D., *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282*, Cambridge, 1959.
- 'Greco-Latin Relations on the Eve of the Byzantine Restoration: the Battle of Pelagonia', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953), 99–141.
- Geijer, Agnes, 'Some Thoughts on the Problems of Early Oriental Carpets', *Ars Orientalis* 5 (1963), 79–87.
- Gerland, E., *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinople, I: Geschichte der Kaiser Baldwin I und Heinrich 1204–16*, Homburg v.d. Höhe, 1905.
- Geyer, B. and J. Lefort (eds.), *La Bithynie au moyen âge*, Paris, 2003.
- Gibb, E. J. W., *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, 6 vols., London, 1909.
- Gill, J., *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge, 1959.
- Glykatzi-Ahrweiler, H., 'Les fortresses construites en Asie Mineure face à l'invasion seldjoudide', in *Akten des internationalen Byzantinisten Kongresses*, Munich, 1958.
- 'Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX–XIe siècles', *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique* 84 (1960).
- Göckenjan, Hansgerd, *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*, Wiesbaden, 1972.
- Göde, Kemal, *Eratnalılar (1327–1381)*, Ankara, 1994.
- Godfrey, J., *1204: the Unholy Crusade*, Oxford, 1980.
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlâd-i Fâtihân*, Istanbul, 1957.
- Gökoğlu, A., *Paphlagonia Paplagonya (Kastamonu, Sinop, Çankırı, Safranbolu, Bartın, Bolu, Gerede, Mudurnu, İskilip, Bafra, Alaçam ve Civarı) Gayrimenkul Eski Eserleri Arkeoloji*, Kastamonu, 1952.
- Golden, Peter B., *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*, Wiesbaden, 1992.
- 'The Migrations of the Oğuz', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972), 45–84.

- 'The Turks: a Historical Overview', in *Turks: a Journey of a Thousand Years, 600–1600*, ed. David J. Roxburgh, London, 2005, pp. 18–31.
- 'War and Warfare in the Pre-Çinggisid Western Steppes of Eurasia', in *Warfare in Inner Asian History, 500–1800*, ed. Nicola Di Cosmo, Leiden, 2002, pp. 105–72.
- Gölpınarlı, A., 'Âşık Paşa'nın Şiirleri', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 5 (1936), 87–101.
- 'İslâm ve Türk İllerinde Fütüvvet Teşkilatı ve Kaynakları', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11 (1952), 1–354.
- Mevlânâ Celâleddîn, Istanbul, 1959.
- Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik, Istanbul, 1953.
- Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1961, repr. 1992.
- Goodwin, Godfrey, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, Baltimore, 1971.
- Gouloulis, Stavros G., *Ἀντωνίου Λαρίσσης Ἐγκώμιο εἰς ἄγιον Κυπριανὸν Λαρίσσης*, Larissa, 1991.
- Göyünç, N., XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı, Ankara, 1991.
- Gradeva, Rositsa and Svetlana Ivanova (eds.), *Mjuzjulmanskata Kultura po Bălgarskite Zemi*, Sofia, 1998.
- Graus, František, 'Die Entstehung der mittelalterlichen Staates in Mitteleuropa', *Historica* 10 (1965), 5–65.
- Grignaschi, Mario, 'Les guerriers domestiques dans la féodalité turque', in VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara 20–26 Ekim 1961. Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler, Ankara, 1967, pp. 206–30.
- Grousset, R., *L'empire des steppes*, Paris, 1948.
- Grousset, René, *Die Steppenvölker, Attila, Dschingis Khan, Tamerlan*, Munich, 1970.
- Grube, Ernst J., 'The Miniatures in Ahmedî's İskendar-Nama in the Marciana Library in Venice and the Origins of Ottoman Painting', in VI Internationaler Kongress für türkische Kunst, München, 3.–7. September 1979. Kurzfassungen der Kongressreferate, ed. Klaus Kreiser, Munich, 1987, pp. 536–53.
- 'Notes on Ottoman Painting in the Fifteenth Century', in *Essays in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Katharina Otto-Dorn*, ed. Abbas Daneshvari, Malibu, 1981, pp. 51–61.
- Grumel, V., 'Au seuil de la deuxième croisade: deux lettres de Manuel Comnène au Pape', *Études Byzantines* 3 (1945), 143–67.
- Guest, J., *Survival among the Kurds: a History of the Yazidis*, London, 1993.
- Guillard, J., 'L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XIIe siècle', *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 299–324.
- Gündüz, T., 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Türkmenler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. Y. A. Ocak, Ankara, 2006.
- Gürçay, Hikmet, 'La Turbé de Hacı Tuğrul sur la route de Ankara – Polatlı', in *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, ed. Géza Fehér, Budapest, 1978, pp. 395–406.
- Gurlitt, Cornelius, 'Die Bauten Adrianopels', *Orientalisches Archiv* 1 (1910–11), 52–5.
- 'Die islamischen Bauten von Iznik (Nicæa)', *Orientalisches Archiv* 3 (1912–13), 49–60.
- Güzel, Hasan Celal, Cem Oğuz and Osman Karatay (eds.), *The Turks*, 6 vols., Ankara, 2002.
- Györffy, György, 'Die Rolle des buyruq in der alttürkischen Gesellschaft', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 11 (1960), 169–79.
- Hadžibegić, Hamid, Adem Handžić and Ešref Kovačević, *Oblast Brankovića. Opširni katarski popis iz 1455 godine*, 2 vols., Sarajevo, 1972.
- Halecki, O., *Un empereur à Rome*, Warsaw, 1930.

- Halil, Edhem, 'Âl-i Germiyan Kitâbeleri', *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* 2 (1910), 103–11.
 Kayseriyye Şehri, Istanbul, AH 1334.
- Hall, Bert S., *Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics*, Baltimore and London, 1997.
- Halman, T. S., *The Humanist Poetry of Yunus Emre*, Istanbul, 1971.
- Halman, T. S. (ed.), *Yunus Emre and his Mystical Poetry*, 2 vols., Bloomington, 1989.
- Harvey, Alan, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200*, Cambridge, 1981.
- Hasluck, F. W., *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1929.
- Hegyi, Klára, 'Magyar és balkáni katonaparasztkok a budai vilájet déli szandzsákjaiban', *Századok* 135, 6 (2001), 1255–311.
- Herrin, J., 'The Collapse of the Byzantine Empire in the Twelfth Century: a Study of a Medieval Economy', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12, 2 (1970), 186–203.
- Heyd, W., *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1967.
- Heywood, Colin, 'The 1337 Bursa Inscription and its Interpreters', *Turcica* 36 (2004), 215–32.
- '"Boundless Dreams of the Levant": Paul Wittek, the George-Kreis, and the Writing of Ottoman History', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1989), 30–50.
- 'The Frontier in Ottoman History: Old Ideas and New Myths', in *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, ed. Daniel Power and Naomi Standen, London, 1998, pp. 228–50.
- 'Notes on the Production of Fifteenth-Century Ottoman Cannon,' in Colin Heywood, *Writing Ottoman History: Documents and Interpretations*, Aldershot, 2002, XVI.
- 'A Subterranean History: Paul Wittek (1894–1978) and the Ottoman State,' *Die Welt des Islams* 38 (1998), 386–405.
- 'Wittek and the Austrian Tradition', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1988), 7–25.
- Writing Ottoman History: Documents and Interpretations*, Aldershot, 2002.
- Heywood, Colin and Colin Imber (eds.), *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, Istanbul, 1994.
- Hillenbrand, C., 'Mu' in al-Din Parwana: the Servant of Two Masters?', in *Miscellanea Arabica et Islamica*, ed. F. de Jong, Leuven, 1993, pp. 267–74.
- Hillenbrand, R., *The Art of the Saljuqs in Iran and Anatolia*, Costa Mesa, 1994.
- Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning*, Edinburgh, 1994.
- Hoffmann, Eric, 'Knut der Heilige und die Wende der dänische Geschichte im 11. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift* 218 (1974), 529–70.
- Holbach, Uwe, *Der russische Fürstenhof vor 16. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart, 1985.
- Holt, P. M., Ann K. S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Islam*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1970.
- Horváth, Andras P., *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary*, Budapest, 1989.
- Hötsch, Otto, 'Adel und Lehnwesen in Rußland und Polen und ihr Verhältnis zur deutschen Entwicklung', *Historische Zeitschrift* 108 (1912), 541–92.
- Hrochová, V., 'La révolte des Zélotes à Salonique et les communes italiennes', *Byzantinoslavica* 22 (1961), 1–15.
- Husing, G., *Zur Rostahmsage-Sajjid Battal*, Leipzig, 1913.
- Hussey, J. M., 'The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century: Some Different Interpretations', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser. 32 (1950), 71–85.

Bibliography

- 'Byzantium and the Crusades, 1081–1204', in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. II, ed. K. M. Setton, Pennsylvania, 1962, pp. 123–51.
- The Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. IV: *The Byzantine Empire*, Cambridge, 1967.
- The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford, 1990.
- İbrahimgil, Mehmet and Neval Konuk, *Kosova Sultan Murad Hüdavendigâr Türbesi*, Ankara, 2005.
- İlaydın, Hikmet, 'Anadolu'da Klasik Türk Şiirinin Başlangıcı', in *Makaleler*, ed. Nihal İlaydın, Ankara, 1999, pp. 765–74.
- 'Dehhânî'nin Şiirleri', in *Ömer Asım Aksoy Armağanı*, ed. Mustafa Canpolat, Semih Tezcan and Mustafa Şerif Onaran, Ankara, 1978, pp. 136–76.
- İlter, Fügen, 'An East Anatolian Building from the Age of Timur: Yelmaniye Medrese', *Anadolu (Anatolia)* 17 (1973), 109–22.
- 'The Main Features of the Seljuk, the Beylik and the Ottoman Bridges of the Turkish Anatolian Architecture from the XIIIth to the XVIth Centuries', *Belleten* 57 (1993), 481–95.
- 'Über einige bedeutende türkische Bauten in Osmancık und İskilip', in *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, ed. Géza Fehér, Budapest, 1978, pp. 433–56.
- Imber, Colin, 'Before the Kapudan Pasha: Sea Power and the Emergence of the Ottoman Empire', in *Kapudan Pasha: his Office and his Domain*, ed. Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 2002, pp. 49–59.
- 'Canon and Apocrypha in Early Ottoman History', in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. Colin Heywood and Colin Imber, Istanbul, 1994, pp. 117–37.
- 'The Legend of Osman Gazi', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1993, pp. 67–75.
- 'The Origin of the Janissaries', *Journal of Turkish Studies* 26, 2 (2002), 15–19.
- 'The Ottoman Dynastic Myth', *Turcica* 19 (1987), 7–27.
- The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1481*, Istanbul, 1990.
- The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1650: The Structure of Power*, Houndmills and New York, 2002.
- 'Paul Wittek's "De la défaite d'Ankara à la prise de Constantinople"', *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 5 (1986), 65–81.
- 'What Does "Ghazi" Actually Mean?', in *The Balance of Truth: Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, ed. Çiğdem Balım-Harding and Colin Imber, Istanbul, 2000, pp. 165–78.
- İnalcık, H., '15. Asır Türkiye İktisadi ve İctimai tarihi Kaynakları', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 15, 1–4 (1953–4), 51–67.
- '1431 Tarihli Timar Defterine Göre Fatih Devrinden Önce Timar Sistemi', in *IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara, 1948*, Ankara, 1952, pp. 132–9.
- 'Bursa I XV. Asır Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihine Dair Vesikalar', *Belleten* 24, 93 (1960), 45–102.
- 'Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3, 2 (1960), 131–47.
- 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire', *The Journal of European History* 19 (1969), 97–140.
- 'How to read 'Ashık Pasha-Zade's History', in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, eds. Colin Heywood and Colin Imber, Istanbul, 1994, pp. 139–56.
- 'Köy, Köylü ve İmparatorluk', *Marmara Üniversitesi V. Milletlerarası Türkiye Sosyal ve İktisat Tarihi Kongresi*, Ankara, 1990, pp. 1–11.

- The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, Bloomington, 1987.
- 'Notes on a Study of the Turkish Economy during the Establishment and Rise of the Ottoman Empire', in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire. Essays on Economy and Society*, Bloomington, 1993, pp. 205–63.
- 'Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış', in *Osmanlı*, vol. I, ed. Güler Eren, Kemal Çiçek and Cem Oğuz, Ankara, 1999, pp. 37–116.
- 'The Ottoman Economic Mind and Aspects of the Ottoman Economy', in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*, ed. M. A. Cook, London, 1970, pp. 207–18.
- The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age 1300–1600*, London, 1973.
- 'Ottoman Methods of Conquest', *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954), 104–29.
- 'The Problem of the Relationship between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation', in *Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongresses 1958*, Munich, 1960, pp. 237–42.
- 'The Question of the Emergence of the Ottoman State', *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 2, 2 (1981–2), 71–81.
- 'The Rise of the Ottoman Empire', in *A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, ed. M. A. Cook, Cambridge, 1976.
- 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, London, 1962, pp. 152–67.
- 'Sources for Fifteenth-Century Turkish Economic and Social History', in Halil İnalcık, *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, Bloomington, 1993, pp. 177–93.
- Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic History*, London, 1985.
- 'The Yürük: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role', in *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies*, vol. II: *Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400–1600*, ed. Robert Pinner and Walter B. Denny, London, 1986, pp. 39–65.
- İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, Cambridge, 1994.
- İnbaşı, Mehmet, *Rumeli Yörükleri (1544–1675)*, Erzurum, 2000.
- İpekten, Halûk, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebi Muhitler*, İstanbul, 1996.
- İsen, Mustafa, 'Başlangıçtan XVIII. Yüzyıla Kadar Türk Edebiyatı', in *Türkler*, vol. XI, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca, İstanbul, 2003, pp. 532–72.
- 'Nesir', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 521–32.
- Itani, K., 'The Rum Sultanate after the Mongol Invasion', *The Toyoshi-Kenkyu* 39, 2 (1980), 110–39.
- İz, F., *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Nazım*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1995.
- Jackson, P., 'The Dissolution of the Mongol Empire', *Central Asiatic Journal* 22 (1978), 186–244.
- Jacoby, D., 'Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Romanie (1305–1332)', *Studi Medievali* ser. 3 15 (1947), 217–61.
- 'The Economy of Latin Constantinople, 1204–61', in *Urbs Capta: the Fourth Crusade and its Consequences/La IVe croisade et ses conséquences*, ed. A. E. Laiou, Paris, 2005, pp. 195–214.

- 'Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: a Reconsideration', *Anuario de estudios medievales* 24 (1994), 349–69.
- 'Production et commerce de l'alun oriental en Méditerranée, XIe–XVe siècles', in *L'alun de Méditerranée*, ed. Philippe Borgard, Jean-Pierre Brun and Maurice Picon, Naples and Aix-en-Provence, 2005, pp. 219–67.
- Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle*, London, 1979.
- Trade Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, 1997.
- 'The Venetian Government and Administration in Latin Constantinople in 1204–61: a State within a State', in *Quarta Crociata: Venezia – Bisanzio – Impero Latino*, eds. G. Ortali, G. Revignani and P. Schreiner, Venice, 2006.
- 'The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople from 1082–1261: Topographical Considerations', in *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. C. Sode and S. Takács, Aldershot, 2001, pp. 153–70.
- Janin, R., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, 3 vols., Paris, 1969.
- Jarry, J., *Hérésies et factions dans l'empire byzantin*, Cairo, 1968.
- Jemma, E., 'Il Fakr-nâme. Libro della povertà di Âşîq Pasa', *Estatto dalla Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 29 (1954), 219–45.
- Jireček, Constantin, 'Überreste der Petschenegen und Kumanen sowie über die Völkerschaften der sogenannten Gagauzi und Surguči im heutigen Bulgarien', in *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Prague, 1889.
- Johanson, Lars, 'Rûmî and the Birth of Turkish Poetry', *Journal of Turkology* 1, 1 (1993), 23–37.
- Jorga, N., *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches nach den Quellen dargestellt. Erster Band (bis 1451)*, Gotha, 1908.
- Kaegi, W. E., *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium*, Chicago, 1982.
- Kafadar, C., *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1995.
- Kafescioğlu, Çiğdem and Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (eds.), *Aptullah Kuran İçin Yazılar Essays in Honour of Aptullah Kuran*, Istanbul, 1999.
- Kafesoğlu, İ., *A History of the Seljuks*, ed. and tr. G. Leiser as *A History of the Seljuks: İbrahim Kafesoğlu's Interpretation and the Resulting Controversy*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1988.
- Kaftantzis, G., *Οί Σέρρες άλλοτε και τώρα. Αφιέρωμα*, Thessalonike, 1985.
- Kahane, Henry, Renée Kahane and Andreas Tietze, *The Lingua Franca in the Levant: Turkish Nautical Terms of Italian and Greek Origin*, Urbana, 1958.
- Kahya, E., 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Bilim', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2006.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gyula, 'The First Centuries of the Ottoman Military Organization', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31, 2 (1977), 147–83.
- Kaleši, Hasan, 'Najstarija vakufnema u Jugoslaviji', *Prilozi za Orientalnu Filologiju* 10–11 (1961), 55–74.
- Kalpakkı, Mehmet, 'Osmanlı Şiirine Genel Bir Bakış Denemesi', *Doğu-Batı* 6, 22 (2003), 39–52.
- Kalus, Ludvik, 'L'inscription de Bursa au nom du sultan Orhân, datée de 738/1337–38: comment faut-il la lire?', *Turcica* 36 (2004), 233–51.
- Kăncov, Vasil, *Makedonija, Etnografija, Statistika*, Sofia, 1900.
- Kaplan, M., *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VIe au XIe siècle: propriété et exploitation du sol*, Paris, 1992.

- 'Les villageois aux premiers siècles byzantines (VIe-Xe): une société homogène?', *Byzantino-Slavica* 43 (1982), 202-17.
- Kara, S., *Selçuklular'ın Dini Serüveni: Türkiye'nin Dini Yapısının Tarihsel Arka Plânı*, İstanbul, 2006.
- Karabacek, J., 'Gigliato des jonischen Turkomanenfürsten Omar-beg', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 2 (1870), 525-38.
- 'Gigliato des karischen Turkomanenfürsten Urchan-beg', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 9 (1877), 200-15.
- Karaismailoğlu, A., 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Farsça ve Farsça Eserler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurluğu I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 487-92.
- Karamağaralı, Bayhan, 'Anadolu'da XII-XVI. Asırlardaki Tarikat ve Tekke Sanatı Hakkında', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 21 (1976), 247-84.
- Karamağaralı, Halûk, 'Çorum Ulu Câmiindeki Minber', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 1 (1964-65), 120-42.
- Karamustafa, A. T., *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550*, Salt Lake City, 1994.
- 'Origins of Anatolian Sufism', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2005, pp. 67-96.
- Karatay, Osman and Bilgehan A. Gökdağ (eds.), *Balkanlar El Kitabı*, Ankara, 2006.
- Kartal, Ahmet, 'Anadolu'da Farsça Şiir Söyleyen Türk Şâirleri', in *Türkler*, vol. VII, ed. H. C. Güzel, K. Çiçek and S. Koca, Ankara, 2002, pp. 680-93.
- 'Attâr'ın *Tezkiretü'l-Evliyâ* İsimli Eseri ve Türkçe Tercümeleri', in *Diriözler Armağanı, Prof. Dr. Meserret Diriöz ve Haydar Ali Diriöz Hatıra Kitabı*, ed. M. Fatih Köksal and A. Naci Baykoca, Ankara, 2003, pp. 383-405.
- 'Sa'dî-i Şîrâzî'nin *Gülîstân* İsimli Eseri'nin Türkçe Tercümeleri', *Bilig* 16 (2001), 99-126.
- Kerametli, Can, 'Osmanlı Ağaç İşleri, Tahta, Oyma, Sedef, Bağ ve Fildişi Kakmalar', *Türk Etnoğrafya Dergisi* 4 (1962), 5-13.
- Kiefer, Charles, 'Les céramiques siliceuses d'Anatolie et du Moyen-Orient', *Bulletin de la Société Française de la Ceramique* 30 (1956), 5-34.
- Kiel, Machiel, 'Bulgaristan'da Eski Osmanlı Mimarisinin Bir Yapıtı Kalugerevo Nova Zagora'daki Kidemli Baba Sultan Bektaşî', *Belleten* 35, 137 (1971), 45-60.
- 'İstorijata na "nasilstveno masovo pomjusjulmančvane" na Rodopskite Hristijani i njakoi izvori, svırzani s nego. Osmanskite registri na naselioto i danáčnoto oblagane ot XVI-XVII v.: Kraijat na Mitologijata?', in *Mjusjulmanskata Kultura po Bălgarskite Zemi*, ed. Rositsa Gradeva and Svetlana Ivanova, Sofia, 1998, pp. 56-126.
- 'Notes on Some Turkish Monuments in Thessaloniki', *Balkan Studies* 11 (1970), 123-48.
- 'Observations on the History of Northern Greece during the Turkish Rule: Historical and Architectural Description of the Turkish Monuments of Komotini and Serres, their Place in the Development of Ottoman Turkish Architecture and their Present Condition', *Balkan Studies* 12 (1971), 415-44.
- 'The Oldest Monuments of Ottoman-Turkish Architecture in the Balkans: the İmaret of Gazi Evrenos in Gümülcine (Komotini) and the Evrenos Bey Khan in the Village of İlica/Loutro in Greek Thrace (1370-1390)', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 12 (1983), 117-38.

- 'Osmanische Baudenkmäler in Südosteuropa, Typology und Verhältniss zur Lokalen Kunst – Probleme der Erhaltung in den heutigen Nationalstaaten', in *Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die Osmanen*, ed. Hans Georg Majer, Munich, 1989, pp. 23–76.
- 'Some Early Ottoman Monuments in Bulgarian Thrace, Stara Zagora, Jambol and Nova Zagora', *Belleten* 38, 152 (1974), 644–9.
- Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans*, Aldershot, 1990.
- 'Das türkische Thessalien, etabliertes geschichtsbild versus osmanische quellen. Ein beitrage zur entmythologisierung der geschichte Griechenlands', *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil. Hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge* No. 212, 1996, 153–65.
- 'Two Monuments of Early and Classical Ottoman Architecture in Greek Thrace', *Balkan Studies* 22 (1981), 127–46.
- 'Yenice-i Vardar (Vardar Yenicesi – Giannitsa): a Forgotten Turkish Cultural Centre in Macedonia of the 15th and 16th Century', *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica* 3 (1971), 300–55.
- Kilisli Muallim Rifat, 'Süheyl ü Nev-Bahâr'a Dâir', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1928), 401–19.
- Kissling, H. J., 'Aus der Geschichte des Chalvetijje-Ordens', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 103 (1958), 233–89.
- Kızıltan, Ali, *Anadolu Beyliklerinde Cami ve Mescitler*, Istanbul, 1958.
- Kleiner, G., *Die Ruinen von Milet*, Berlin, 1968.
- Kliashstornyi, S. G. and D. G. Savinov, *Istoriia Tsantral'noi Azii i pamiatniki runicheskogo pis'ma*, St Petersburg, 2003.
- Koç, Y., 'Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Türkiye'de Yerleşme ve Nüfus', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Yaşar Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 241–8.
- 'Selçuklular Döneminde Anadolu'da Köyler ve Köylüler', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Yaşar Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 293–8.
- Kolbas, Judith, *The Mongols in Iran: Chingiz Khan to Uljaytu 1220–1309*, London, 2006.
- Konyalı, İbrahim Hakkı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Erzurum Tarihi*, Istanbul, 1960.
- Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Karaman Tarihi Ermenek ve Mut Âbideleri*, Istanbul, 1967.
- Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Konya Tarihi*, Konya, 1964.
- Nasreddin Hoca'nın Şehri Akşehir, *Tarihi Turistik Kılavuz*, Istanbul, 1945.
- Söğüt'de Ertuğrul Gazi Türbesi ve İhtifali*, Istanbul, 1959.
- Köprülü, M. Fuad, *Alcune osservazioni intorno all'influenza delle istituzioni bizantine sulle istituzioni ottomane*, Rome, 1953.
- 'Anadolu'da İslâmiyet: Türk İstilasından Sonra Anadolu Tarih-i Diniyesine Bir Nazar ve Bu Tarihin Menba'ları', *Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 3–4 (1338/1922), 303–11.
- 'Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları I', *Belleten* 7, 27 (1943), 379–425.
- 'Anatolische Dichter in der Seldschukenzeit, I: Sejjad Hamza', *Körösi Csoma Archivum* 1, 3 (1922), 183–9.
- 'Anatolische Dichter in der Seldschukenzeit, II: Ahmed Faqih', *Körösi Csoma Archivum* 2, 1–2 (1926), 20–38.
- Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, tr. G. Leiser, Salt Lake City, 1993.
- The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. and tr. G. Leiser, Albany, 1992.

- Les origines de l'empire ottoman*, Paris, 1935.
- Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Kuruluşu*, 2nd edn, Ankara, 1972.
- 'Selçukiler Devri Edebiyatı Hakkında Bazı Notlar', *Hayat Mecmuası* 4, 102 (1928), 488–90.
- 'Selçukiler Devrinde Anadolu Şairleri: Hoca Dehhâni', *Hayat Mecmuası* 1 (1926), 4–5.
- 'Selçukiler Devrinde Anadolu Şairleri, II: Ahmed Fakîh', *Türk Yurdu* 4, 26 (1926), 286–95.
- The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources*, tr. G. Leiser, Salt Lake City, 1993.
- 'Şeyyad Hamza', *Dergâh* 1, 4 (AH 1337), 51.
- Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, 3 vols., Ankara, 1966; repr. 1976.
- 'Vakıf Müessesesinin Hukuki Mahiyeti ve Tarihi Tekamülü', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), 1–36.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep, 'Anadolu Selçuklular Çağı Türkçesinin Genel Yapısı', *TDAY Belleten* (1972), 17–34.
- 'Erzurumlu Darîr ve Memluk Türkçesinin Oğuzcalaşmasındaki Yeri', in *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols., ed. Zeynep Korkmaz, Ankara, 1995, 1, pp. 435–8.
- 'Kâbus-Nâme ve Marzubân-nâme Çevirileri Kimindir', in *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols., ed. Zeynep Korkmaz, Ankara, 1995, 1, pp. 365–74.
- 'Sadrü'd-Dîn Şeyhoğlu ve Marzubân-nâme Tercümesi', in Korkmaz, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1995, 1, pp. 381–401.
- 'Şeyhoğlu, Mustafa (Sadrü'd-Dîn)', in Korkmaz, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1995, 1, 402–18.
- Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1995.
- Kortantamer, Tunca, 'Ahmed-i Dâ'î ile İlgili Yeni Bilgiler', in *Eski Türk Edebiyatı, Makaleler*, Ankara, 1993, pp. 31–75.
- Leben und Weltbild des altosmanischen Dichters Ahmedî unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Diwans*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1973.
- Koşay, H. Z., 'Bektaşilik ve Hacıbektaş Türbesi', *Türk Etnografya Dergisi* 10 (1968), 19–26.
- Kowalski, Tadeusz, *Les Turcs et la langue turc de la Bulgarie du nord-est*, Krakow, 1933.
- Köymen, Mehmet Altay, 'Alp Arslan Zamanı Selçuklu Askerî Teşkilâtı', *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5 (1967), 1–74.
- Büyük Selçuklu İmparatorluğu Tarihi, I: Kuruluş Devri, II: İkinci İmparatorluk Devri*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1984–9.
- 'Türkiye Selçukluları Devleti'nin Ekonomik Politikası', *Belleten* 50, 198 (1986), 613–20.
- Kramer, J., 'Architecturteile des Seyitgazi-Tekke (Vilâyet Eskişehir) und die Michaelskirche von Nakoleia', *Jahrbuch des Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 22 (1973), 241–50.
- Kreiser, Klaus (ed.), *VI Internationaler Kongress für türkische Kunst, München, 3.–7. September 1979. Kurzfassungen der Kongressreferate*, Munich, 1987.
- Krekić, B., *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au moyen-âge*, Paris and The Hague, 1961.
- Kuban, Doğan, *Anadolu Gezilerinden İzlenimler: Bir Batı Anadolu Gezisi (Şubat 1962)*, Istanbul, 1962.
- 'Claude Cahen's "Pre-Ottoman Turkey" and some Observations on the Turkish City, Turkish Art and Architecture in Anatolia', *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 2 (1970), 19–30.
- Kühnel, E., 'Der Mamlukische Kassettenstil', *Kunst des Orients* 1 (1950), 55–68.
- Kumbaraci-Bogojević, Lidija, *Osmanlijski Spomenici vo Skopje*, Skopje, 1998.
- Kuntsmann, Fr., *Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren, Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. VII, Munich, 1855.
- Kuran, Aptullah, *Anadolu Medreseleri*, vol. I, Ankara, 1969.

- 'Basic Space and Form Concepts in Early Ottoman Mosque Architecture', in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca, Venezia 26-29 Settembre 1963*, Naples, 1965, pp. 181-6.
- 'The Feature of the Adjoining Classroom-and-Iwan in Ottoman Architecture', in *IV. Internationaler Kongress für Türkische Kunst, München, 3.-7. September 1979, Kurzfassungen der Kongressreferate*, n.d., n.p., p. 64.
- 'Karamanlı Medreseleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 8 (1969), 216-17.
- The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, Chicago, 1968.
- 'A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne and Istanbul', *Muqarnas* 13 (1996), 114-31.
- 'Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Mosques in Turkey', *Archaeology* 24 (1971), 234-53.
- Kurat, A. N., 'Çaka Bey': İzmir ve Civarındaki Adaların İlk Türk Beyi, M.S. 1081-1095, Ankara, 1966.
- Kut, G., '13. Yüzyıla Ait Bir Yemek Kitabı', *Kaynaklar* 3 (1984), 50-7.
- 'Erken Dönem Nazım (XIII-XIV. Yüzyıl)', in *Türk Dünyası Edebiyat Tarihi*, ed. Zeynep Korkmaz, Ankara, 2004, pp. 304-564.
- 'Tabiat-nâme ve Tatlılar Üzerine Bir Yazma Eser: Et-Terkibât fî Tabhi'l-Hulviyyât', *Folklor ve Etnografya Araştırmaları* (1985), 179-95.
- Laiou, A. E., *Constantinople and the Latins: the Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328*, Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- 'Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks: the Background to the Anti-Turkish League of 1332-1334', *Speculum* 45 (1970), 374-92.
- 'The Provisioning of Constantinople during the Winter of 1306-1307', *Byzantion* 37 (1967), 91-113.
- (ed.), *Urbs Capta: The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences / La IVe croisade et ses consequences*, Paris, 2005.
- Laiou, A. E. and Charalambos Bouras (eds.), *The Economic History of Byzantium from the Seventh Century through to the Fifteenth Century*, 3 vols., Washington, DC, 2002.
- Laiou-Thomadakis, A. E., 'The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System: 13th-15th Centuries', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34, 5 (1980/1), 177-222.
- 'The Greek Merchant of the Palaeologan Period: a Collective Portrait', *Praktika tes Akademias Athenon* 57 (1982), 96-132.
- Lambros, P., 'Monnaie inédite de Sarukhan émir d'Ionie, frappée à Ephèse (1299-1346)', *Revue Numismatique*, n.s., 14 (1869-70), 335-43.
- Lambton, A. K. S., *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia*, Albany, 1988.
- 'Mongol Fiscal Administration in Persia (Part II)', *Studia Islamica* 65 (1987), 97-123.
- Lamm, C. J., 'The Marby Rug and Some Other Fragments of Carpets Found in Egypt', *Svenska Örientsällskapet Arsbok*, Stockholm (1937), 51-130.
- Lane, Arthur, 'The Ottoman Pottery of Iznik', *Ars Orientalis* 2 (1957), 247-81.
- Lane, G., *Early Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Iran: a Persian Renaissance*, London, 2003.
- Leib, B., 'Jean Doukas, César et moine, son jeu politique à Byzance de 1067 à 1081', in *Mélanges P. Peeters*, vol. II, *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 163-80.
- Leiser, G., 'The Madrasah and the Islamization of Anatolia before the Ottomans', in *Law and Education in Medieval Islam: Studies in Memory of Professor George Makdisi*, ed. Joseph E. Lowry, Devin J. Stewart and Shawkat M. Toorawa, London, 2004, pp. 176-82.

Bibliography

- Lemerle, P., *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century*, Galway, 1979.
- 'Byzance et la croisade: l'idée de croisade', in *Relazioni del X congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* 3, Florence, 1955, 595–620; repr. in Lemerle, *Le monde de Byzance: histoire et institutions*, Aldershot, 1978, VIII.
- Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle byzantin*, Paris, 1977.
- L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident: recherches sur 'La geste d'Umur Pacha'*, Paris, 1957.
- 'Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIII^e siècle', *Revue Historique* 211–12 (1954), 265–308.
- Lescot, R., *Enquête sur les Yezîdis de Syrie et du Djebel Sindjar*, Beirut, 1938.
- Levend, Âgah Sirri, 'Attar ile Tutmacı'nın Gül ü Husrev Mesnevileri', *TDAY Belleten* 1959 (1988), 161–203.
- Lewis, Bernard and P. M. Holt (eds.), *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962.
- Lewis, Franklin D., *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West: the Life, Teaching and Poetry of Jalâl al-Din Rumi*, Oxford, 2000.
- Liagre, Léone, 'Le commerce de l'alun en Flandre au moyen âge', *Le Moyen Âge* 61 (1955), 177–206.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States (1096–1204)*, tr. J. C. Morris and J. F. Ridings, Oxford, 1993.
- Lindner, Rudi Paul, 'Beginning Ottoman History', in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. Colin Heywood and Colin Imber, Istanbul, 1994, pp. 199–208.
- 'The Challenge of Qılıç Arslan IV', in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History: Studies in Honor of George C. Miles*, ed. D. K. Kouymjian, Beirut, 1974.
- Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, Ann Arbor, 2007.
- 'Hordes and Hoards in Late Saljuq Anatolia', in *The Art of the Saljuqs in Iran and Anatolia*, ed. R. Hillenbrand, Costa Mesa, 1994.
- 'How Mongol were the Early Ottomans?', in *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, ed. R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan, Leiden, 1999, pp. 282–9.
- Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, Bloomington, 1983.
- 'Stimulus and Justification in Early Ottoman History,' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 27 (1982), 207–24.
- Lloyd, Seton and D. Storm Rice, *Alanya ('Ala'iyya)*, London, 1958.
- Loenertz, R.-J., 'Athènes et Néopatras, registes et notices pour servir à l'histoire des duchés catalans (1311–1394)', *Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum* 25 (1955), 100–212, 428–431; 28 (1958), 5–91.
- 'La chronique brève moréote de 1423. Texte, traduction et commentaire', in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. II, Vatican City, 1964, pp. 399–439.
- 'Pour l'histoire du Péloponèse au XIV^e siècle (1382–1404)', *Études Byzantines* 1 (1943), 152–96.
- 'Hospitaliers et Navarais en Grèce 1376–1383. Régestes et documents', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 22 (1956), 319–60.
- 'Manuel Paléologue, Épître à Cabasilas', *Μακεδονικά* 4 (1956), 35–7.
- Loenertz, R.-J. and Peter Schreiner (eds.), *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca articles parus de 1935 à 1966*, Rome, 1970.
- Longnon, J., 'La reprise de Salonique par les grecs en 1224', in *Actes du VI^e congrès international d'études byzantines*, vol. I, Paris, 1950, pp. 141–6.

- Lowry, Heath, 'Calligraphy – Hüsn-i Hat', in *Tulips, Arabesques and Turbans: Decorative Arts from the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Yanni Petsopoulos, New York, 1982, pp. 169–93.
- The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, Albany, 2003.
- The Shaping of the Ottoman Balkans, 1350–1550*, Istanbul, 2008.
- Luttrell, Anthony, 'The Hospitallers of Rhodes Confront the Turks: 1306–1421', in *Christians, Jews and Other Worlds: Patterns of Conflict and Accommodation*, ed. Philip F. Gallagher, Lanham, New York and London, 1988.
- 'Intrigue, Schism, and Violence among the Hospitallers of Rhodes: 1377–1384', *Speculum* 41 (1966), 30–48.
- Mackie, L. W., 'An Early Animal Rug in the Metropolitan Museum', *Hali* 13, 5 (1990), 154–5.
- Mackie, Louise W., 'Rugs and Textiles', in *Turkish Art*, ed. Esin Atıl, Washington, DC, 1980, pp. 299–373.
- McMullan, J. V., 'The Earliest Turkish Rugs', in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca, Venezia 26–29 Settembre 1963*, Naples, 1965, pp. 189–90.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge, 1993.
- Malamut, É., *Alexis Ier Comnène*, Paris, 2007.
- Maltezou, Ch., 'Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli (scali marittimi)', *Θησαυρίσματα* 15 (1978), 30–61.
- Manfroni, C., 'Le relazioni fra Genova, l'impero bizantino ed i Turchi', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 28 (1898), 791–809.
- Mansuroğlu, Mecdüt, 'Anadolu Metinleri, XIII. Asır I: Şeyyad Hamza', *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 7–8, 1 (1942), 95–107.
- Anadolu Türkçesi (XIII. Asır) Dehşani ve Manzumeleri*, Istanbul, 1947.
- 'Anadolu Türkçesi (XIII. Asır) Şeyyad Hamza'nın Doğu Türkçesi ile Karışık Bir Manzumesi', *Türk Dili Belleten*, 3rd ser., 8–9 (1946), 16–29.
- 'Anadolu Türkçesi (XIII. Asır) Şeyyad Hamza'ya Ait Üç Manzume', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 1, 3–4 (1946–7), 180–3.
- Çarhname*, Istanbul, 1956.
- 'Mevlânâ Celaeddin Rûmî'de Türkçe Beyit ve İbâreler', *TDAY Belleten* 1954 (1988), 207–20.
- Sultan Veled'in Türkçe Manzumeleri*, Istanbul, 1958.
- Mantran, Robert (ed.), *Histoire de l'empire ottoman*, Paris, 1989.
- Manz, Beatrice Forbes, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane*, Cambridge, 1989.
- Marquart, Joseph, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge – Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts (ca. 840–940)*, Leipzig, 1903; 2nd edn, Darmstadt, 1961.
- Martin, M. E., 'The Venetian–Seljuk Treaty of 1220', *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), 321–30.
- Martinez, A. P., 'Bullionistic Imperialism: the Īl-Xānīd Mint's Exploitation of the Rūm-Saljūqīd Currency, 654–695H/1256–1296 AD', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 13 (1993–4), 169–276.
- 'Some Notes on the Īl-Xānīd Army', *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 6 (1985 [1987]), 129–242.
- Mas Latrie, L. de, 'Commerce d'Éphèse et de Milet au moyen âge (traité vénétien de 1403 avec l'émir de Palatcha)', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 5th ser., 5 (1864), 219–31.
- 'Des relations politiques et commerciales de l'Asie Mineure avec l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 2nd ser., 2 (1845–6), 120–42.

- Masson-Smith, J. Jr, 'Mongol Nomadism and Middle Eastern Geography: Qishlaqs and Tümens', in *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, ed. R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan, Leiden, 1999, pp. 39–56.
- Matschke, Klaus-Peter, 'Some Merchant Families in Constantinople Before, During and After the Fall of the City 1453', *Balkan Studies* 38, 2 (1997), 219–38.
- Mavrodinov, Nikola, *Starobălgarsko Izkustvo, Izkustvoto na pǎrvoto Bălgarsko Tsarstvo*, Sofia, 1959.
- Mayer, Leo A., *Islamic Woodcarvers and their Works*, Geneva, 1958.
- Mazıoğlu, Hasibe, 'Selçuklular Devrinde Anadolu'da Türk Edebiyatının Başlaması ve Türkçe Yazan Şâirler', in *Malazgirt Armağanı*, Ankara, 1972, pp. 297–316.
- Mehmed Şerefeddin, 'Yezidiler', *Dar al-Funun İlahiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 1, 3 (1926), 1–35.
- Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i 'Osmânî*, 4 vols., Istanbul, AH 1308.
- Meineke, Michael, *Fayencedekorationen seldschukischer Sakralbauten in Kleinasien*, Tübingen, 1976.
- Melikian-Chirvani, A. S., *Islamic Metalwork from the Iranian World, 8th–18th Centuries*, London, 1982.
- Mélikoff, I. 'La divinisation de 'Alî chez les Bektachis-Alevis', in *From History to Theology: Ali in Islamic Beliefs*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2005, pp. 83–110.
- Hadji Bektach: un mythe et ses avatares: genèse et evolution du Soufisme populaire en Turquie*, Leiden, 1998.
- Melville, Ch., 'Abu Sa'îd and the Revolt of the Amirs in 1319', in *L'Iran face à la domination mongole*, ed. D. Aigle, Paris and Tehran, 1997, pp. 89–120.
- 'The Chinese Uighur Animal Calendar in Persian Historiography of the Mongol Period', *Iran* 32 (1994), 83–98.
- 'The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia', in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, ed. Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp. 135–66.
- The Fall of Amır Chupan and the Decline of the Ilkhanate, 1327–37: a Decade of Discord in Mongol Iran*, Bloomington, 1999.
- '"The Year of the Elephant": Mamluk–Mongol Rivalry in the Hejaz in the Reign of Abu Sa'îd (1317–1335)', *Studia Iranica* 21, 2 (1992), 197–214.
- Ménage, V. L., 'The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, London, 1962, pp. 168–79.
- 'Edirne'li Rûhi'ye Atfedilen Osmanlı Tarihi', in *Ord. Prof. İsmail Uzunçarşılı'ya Armağan*, Ankara, 1976, pp. 328–39.
- 'The Islamisation of Anatolia', in *Conversion to Islam*, ed. Nehemia Levizion, New York and London, 1979, pp. 52–67.
- Neshri's History of the Ottomans, the Sources and Development of the Text*, London, 1964.
- 'On the Recensions of Uruj's "History of the Ottomans"', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30 (1967), 314–22.
- 'Some Notes on the Devşirme', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29 (1966), 64–78.
- Mengi, Mine, 'Garib-namede Alplik Geleneğiyle İlgili Bilgiler', *Belleten* 48, 191–2 (1984–5), 481–96.
- Merçil, Erdoğan, 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Türkçe', *Belleten* 67, 248 (2003), 111–17.

Bibliography

- Merhan, Aziz, *Die 'Vogelgespräche' Gülşehris und die Anfänge Der Türkischen Literatur*, Göttingen, 2003.
- Mert, Özcan, 'Kırklareli Kitâbeleri', *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* 25 (1971), 155–62.
- Mertzios, K. D., *Μνημεῖα τῆς Μακεδονικῆς Ἱστορίας*, Thessalonike, 1947.
- Meyendorff, J., 'Projet de Concile Oecuménique en 1367; un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14 (1960), 147–77.
- Milliot, L., *Introduction a l'étude du droit musulman*, Paris, 1953.
- Mills, John, *Carpets in Pictures*, London, 1975.
- 'Early Animal Carpets in Western Paintings', *Halb* 1 (1978), 234–42.
- Minčev, Nikolaj and Peter Koledarov, *Promenite na Imenata i Statute and Selištata na Bălgarija, 1878–1971*, Sofia, 1972.
- Miyatev, Krăstju, *Die mittelalterliche Baukunst in Bulgarien*, Sofia, 1974.
- Mole, M., 'Les Kubrawis entre Sunnisme et Shiisme aux VIIIe et IXe siècle de l'Hégire', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 29 (1961), 61–142.
- Moravcsik, Gyula, *Byzantinoturcica I. Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker, II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den Byzantinischen Quellen*, Budapest, 1942–3.
- Mordtmann, J. H., 'Rûhî Edirnewî', *Mitteilungen zur osmanische Geschichte* 2 (1923–4), 129–36. *Suheil und Nevbehâr, Romantisches Gedicht des Mes'ûd b. Ahmed (8. Jhdt. D. H.)*, Hanover, 1925.
- Morgan, C., 'The Byzantine Claims Commission of 1278', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 69 (1976), 412–38.
- Munro, D. C., 'Did the Emperor Alexius I Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza 1095?', *American Historical Review* 27 (1922), 731–3.
- Muntaner, R., *L'expedició dels Catalans a Orient*, ed. Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer, Barcelona, 1926.
- Musso, G. G., *Navigazione e commercio genovese con il Levante nei documenti dell'Archivio di Stato di Genova (secc. XIV–XV) con appendice documentaria a cura di Maria Silvia Jacopino*, Rome, 1975.
- Mutafchieva, Vera P., *Agrarian Relations in the Ottoman Empire in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, Boulder, 1988.
- Necipoğlu, Gülru, 'From International Timurid to Ottoman: a Change of Taste in Sixteenth-Century Ceramic Tiles', *Muqarnas* 7 (1990), 136–70.
- Necipoğlu, Nevra, 'Ottoman Merchants in Constantinople during the First Half of the Fifteenth Century', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 16 (1992), 158–69.
- Németh, J., 'The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe', *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* [Budapest] 21, 1–2 (1971), 1–52.
- Nicholson, R. A., *Rumi: Poet and Mystic, 1207–1273*, London, 1950.
- Nicol, Donald M., 'A Byzantine Emperor in England: Manuel II's Visit to London in 1400–1401', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12, 2 (1971), 204–25.
- Byzantium: its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World*, Aldershot, 1972.
- Byzantium and Venice: a Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge, 1988.
- The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957.

- The Immortal Emperor: The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, Last Emperor of the Romans*, Cambridge, 1992.
- The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261–1453*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, 1993.
- The Reluctant Emperor: a Biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk, c.1295–1383*, Cambridge, 1996.
- Nicolle, David, *Nicopolis 1396*, Oxford, 1999.
- Nicolle, David and Christa Hook, *The Janissaries*, London, Auckland and Melbourne, 1995.
- Saracen Faris 1050–1250 AD*, London, Auckland and Melbourne, 1994.
- Nicolle, David and Angus McBride, *Armies of the Ottoman Turks 1300–1774*, London, 1983.
- Norris, John, *Early Gunpowder Artillery c.1300–1600*, Ramsbury, 2003.
- Nystazopoulou-Pélékides, M., ‘Venise et la Mer Noire du XIe au XVe siècle’, *Θησαυρίσματα* 8 (1970), 15–51.
- Ocak, A. Y., *Babailer İsyanı: Aleviliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı Yahut Anadolu’da İslâm-Türk Heterodoksisinin Teşekkülü*, İstanbul, 2000.
- ‘Bazı Menâkıbnâmelere Göre XIII.–XV. Yüzyıllardaki İhtidâlarda Heterodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü’, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları (Journal of the Ottoman Studies)* 2 (1981), 31–42.
- ‘Emirci Sultan ve Zâviyesi: XIII. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)’da Bir Babai Şeyhi’, *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 9 (1978), 130–208.
- ‘Hristiyanları Tehcir ve İskân Siyaseti’, *Türk Cihan Hâkimiyeti Mefkûresi Tarihi Türk Dünya Nizamının Milli, İslam, ve İnsani Esasları*, 2 vols., İstanbul, 1969.
- İslâm-Türk İnançlarında Hızır Yahut Hızır-İlyas Kültü*, İstanbul, 2006.
- Kültür Tarihi Kaynağı Olarak Menâkıbnâmeler: Metodolojik Bir Yaklaşım*, Ankara, 1997.
- Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderîler*, Ankara, 1999.
- Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler Yahut Dairenin Dışına Çıkanlar*, 3rd edn, İstanbul, 2003.
- La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l’hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIIIe siècle*, Ankara, 1989.
- Sarı Saltık: *Popüler İslâm’ın Balkanlardaki Destani Öncüsü*, Ankara, 2002.
- ‘The Wafâ’î Tarîqa (Wafâ’iyya) During and After the Period of the Seljuks of Turkey: a New Approach to the History of Popular Mysticism in Turkey’, *Mésogeios* 25–26 (2005), 209–48.
- ‘XIII–XV. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu’da Türk-Hristiyan Dinî Etkileşimler’, *Belleten* 214 (1991), 661–73.
- (ed.), *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, Ankara, 2006.
- (ed.), *From History to Theology: Ali in Islamic Beliefs*, Ankara, 2005.
- (ed.), *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, Ankara, 2005.
- Ögel, Semra, ‘Anadolu Ağaç Oymacılığında Mail Kesim (Der Schrägschnitt in Anatolischer Holzornamentik)’, *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 1 (1964–5), 110–19.
- ‘Anadolu Selçuklu ve Beylikler Devri Ahşap Teknikleri’, *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 3 (1969–70), 135–50.
- Die Kuppelraum in der türkischen Architektur*, İstanbul, 1972.
- Oikonomides, Nicolas, *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*, Aldershot, 1992.

- 'La décomposition de l'empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: à propos de la *Partitio Romaniae*', in *XVe Congrès international des études byzantines: rapports et co-rapports*, vol. I, Athens, 1976, pp. 1–28.
- 'L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'empire byzantin au XIe siècle', *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976), 125–52.
- Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe–XVe siècles)*, Montreal, 1979.
- 'L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe–XIe siècles et le Taktikon de l'Escorial', *XIVe Congrès international des études byzantines: rapports*, vol. II, Bucharest, 1974, pp. 285–302.
- 'From Soldiers of Fortune to Gazi Warriors: the Tzympe Affair,' in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. Colin J. Heywood and Colin Imber, Istanbul, 1994, pp. 239–48.
- 'The Turks in Europe (1305–1313) and the Serbs in Asia Minor (1313)', in *The Ottoman Empire (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1993, pp. 159–68.
- Önder, Mehmet, *Mevlana Şehri Konya*, Ankara, 1971.
- Öney, Gönül, 'Akşehir Ulu Camii', *Anatolia* 9 (1965), 171–84.
- 'Anadolu'da Selçuklu ve Beylikler Devri Ahşap Teknikleri', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 3 (1969–70), 135–49.
- Ankara'da Türk Devri Yapıları (Turkish Period Buildings in Ankara)*, Ankara, 1971.
- Beylikler Devri Sanatı XIV.–XV. Yüzyıl (1300–1453)*, Ankara, 1989.
- Türk Çini Sanatı*, Istanbul, 1977.
- Oral, M. Zeki, 'Anadolu'da Sanat Değeri Olan Ahşap Minberler, Kitabeleri ve Tarihçeleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 5 (1962), 23–78.
- Orgels, P., 'Sabbas Asidéno, dynaste de Sampson', *Byzantion* 10 (1935), 67–80.
- Orhonlu, Cengiz, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Derbend Teşkilâtı*, Istanbul, 1990.
- Origo, Iris, 'The Domestic Enemy: Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', *Speculum* 30 (1955), 321–65.
- The Merchant of Prato, Francesco di Marco Datini*, London, 1957.
- Ostrogorsky, G., *Histoire de l'état byzantin*, Paris, 1956.
- History of the Byzantine State*, tr. J. M. Hussey, Oxford, 1968.
- 'La prise de Serres par les Turcs', *Byzantion* 35 (1965), 302–19.
- Otto-Dorn, Katharina, 'Die Isa Bey Moschee in Ephesus', *Istanbuler Forschungen* 17 (1950), 115–31.
- Das Islamische Iznik, mit einem quellenkundlichen Beitrag von Robert Anhegger*, *Istanbuler Forschungen*, vol. XIII, Berlin, 1941.
- 'Der Mihrab der Arslanhane Moschee in Ankara', *Anatolia* 1 (1956), 21–30.
- 'Nachleben byzantinischer Traditionen in der Moschee Murad's II in Edirne', in *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969*, ed. Henrik Birnbaum and Speros Vryonis Jr., The Hague, 1972, pp. 198–210.
- 'Osmanische Ornaementale Wandmalerei', *Kunst des Orients* 1 (1950), 45–54.
- Türkische Keramik*, Ankara, 1957.
- Ötügen, Y., 'Orhan Gazi (1326–1359) Devrinden Kanuni Sultan Süleyman (1520–1556) Devrinin Sonuna Kadar Osmanlı Medreseleri', *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi: In Memoriam Prof. Albert Louis Gabriel*, 9 (1978), 337–72.

- Ousterhout, Robert, 'Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture', *Muqarnas* 12 (1995), 48–62.
- Öz, Tahsin, *Türk Kumaş ve Kadifeleri*, vol. II, Istanbul, 1951.
- Turkish Ceramics*, Ankara, n.d.
- Turkish Textiles and Velvets: XIV–XVI Centuries*, vol. I, Ankara, 1950.
- Özergin, M. Kemal, 'Eski Bir Rûznâme'ye Göre Rumeli Medreseleri', *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 4/5 (1974), 263–89.
- 'Türkiye Kitabeleri. I. Kale-Kapısı Mescidi (723/1323). II. Şeyh Sinan Türbesi', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 4 (1970–I), 61–72.
- Özgüç, Tahsin, 'Monuments of the Period of Taşkın Paşa's Principality', *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca*, Naples, 1965, pp. 197–201.
- Özönder, Hasan, *Konya Mevlana Dergahı*, Ankara, 1989.
- Öztürk, Said, *Osmanlı Arşiv Belgelerinde Siyakat Yazısı ve Tarihi Gelişimi*, Istanbul, 1996.
- Paker, M., 'Anadolu Beylikler Devri Keramik Sanatı', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 1 (1964–5), 155–66.
- Pálosfalvi, Tamás, *Nikápolytöl Mohácsig 1396–1526*, Budapest, 2005.
- Pamuk, Ş., *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge, 2000.
- Pamuk, Ş. and T. Aykut, *Ak Akçe. Moğol ve İlhanlı Sikkeleri/Mongol and Ilhanid Coins*, Istanbul, 1992.
- Pancaroglu, Oya, 'Architecture, Landscape, and Patronage in Bursa: the Making of an Ottoman Capital City', *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 19 (1995), 40–55.
- Papoulia, Basilike D., *Ursprung und Wesen der 'Knabenlese' im Osmanischen Reich*, Munich, 1963.
- Parry, V. J., 'La manière de combattre', in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V. J. Parry and M. E. Yapp, London, 1975, pp. 218–56.
- Parry, V. J. and M. E. Yapp (eds.), *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, London, 1975.
- Pascu, S. (ed.), *Genovezii la Marea Neagră în secolele XIII–XIV. I Genovesi nel Mar Nero durante i secoli XIII e XIV*, Bucharest, 1977.
- Peacock, A. C. S., 'Ahmad of Niğde's *al-Walad al-Shafiq* and the Seljuk Past', *Anatolian Studies* 54 (2004), 95–107.
- Pennas, Th., *Ἱστορία τῶν Σερρῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Τούρκων μέχρι τῆς ἀπελευθερώσεώς των ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, 1383–1913, 2nd edn, Athens, 1966.
- Pertusi, A., 'Le notizie sulla organizzazione amministrativa e militare dei Turchi nello "Strategicon adversum Turcos" di Lampo Birago (c.1453–1455)', in *Studi sul medioevo cristiano offerti a Raffaello Morghen per il 90 anniversario dell'Istituto Storico Italiano (1883–1973)*, vol. II, Rome, 1974, pp. 669–700.
- Petit, Louis, *Typikon de la Kosmosoteira*, Sofia, 1913.
- Petrosyan, I. E., 'An Illustrated Turkish Manuscript of the Iskender-Name by Ahmedi', *Manuscripta Orientalia* 1 (1995), 47–61.
- Petrović, Djurdjica, 'Fire-arms in the Balkans on the Eve of and After the Ottoman Conquests of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V. J. Parry and M. E. Yapp, London, 1975, pp. 164–94.
- Petsopoulos, Yanni, 'Beyshehir IX', *Halı* 8 (1986), 56–8.

Bibliography

- (ed.), *Tulips, Arabesques and Turbans: Decorative Arts from the Ottoman Empire*, New York, 1982.
- Peuch, H. Ch., *Le Manichéisme*, Paris, 1949.
- 'Le Manichéisme', *Histoire des Religions*, vol. II, Paris, 1972.
- Pfeiffer, Judith, 'Ahmad Tegüder's Second Letter to Qala'un (682/1283)', in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, ed. Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp. 167–202.
- Pfeiffer, Judith and Sholeh A. Quinn (eds.), *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, Wiesbaden, 2006.
- Philippides-Braat, Anna, 'La captivité de Palamas chez les Turcs, dossier et commentaire', *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979), 109–221.
- Pinner, Robert and Walter B. Denny (eds.), *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies*, vol. II: *Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400–1600*, London, 1986.
- Pirenne, H., *Les villes du moyen âges*, Brussels, 1927.
- Pitcher, D. E., *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire, from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century*, Leiden, 1972.
- Polat, M. S., *Selçuklu Göçerlerinin Dünyası: Karacık'tan Aziz George Koluna*, Istanbul, 2004.
- Popovic, A. and G. Veinstein (eds.), *Bektachhiyya: études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant Hadji Bektach*, Istanbul, 1995.
- Power, Daniel and Naomi Standen (eds.), *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, London, 1998.
- Raby, Julian, 'Court and Export, Part I: Market Demands in Ottoman Carpets 1450–1550', in *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies*, vol. II: *Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400–1600*, eds. Robert Pinner and Walter B. Denny, London, 1986, pp. 29–38.
- Rado, Şevket, *Türk Hattatları*, Istanbul, n.d.
- Reindl, Hedda, *Männer um Bayezid*, Berlin, 1983.
- Reinert, Stephen W., 'From Niš to Kosovo Polje, Reflections on Murad I's Final Years', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1993, pp. 169–211.
- Remler, P. N., 'New Light on Economic History from Ilkhanid Accounting Manuals', *Studia Iranica* 14, 2 (1985), 157–77.
- 'Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage: a Currency Community in Fourteenth-Century Anatolia', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 25 (1980), 167–88.
- Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe*, Cairo, 1931.
- Reyhanlı, Tülây, 'Bali Bey Camii, Yenişehir', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 3 (1969–70), 17–32.
- Riefstahl, Rudolf M., 'Early Turkish Tile Revetments in Edirne', *Ars Islamica* 4 (1937), 249–81.
- 'Primitive Rugs of the "Konya" Type in the Mosque of Beyshehir', *The Art Bulletin* 13 (1931), 177–220.
- 'A Seljuk Koran Stand with Lacquer Painted Decoration in the Museum of Konya', *The Art Bulletin* 15 (1933), 361–73.
- Turkish Architecture in Southwest Anatolia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- Riley-Smith, J., *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, London, 1986.
- Ritter, H., 'Die Vier Suhravardi', *Der Islam* 25 (1938).
- Riyâhî, Muhammed Emîn, *Osmanlı Topraklarında Fars Dili ve Edebiyatı*, tr. Mehmet Kanar, Istanbul, 1995.
- Robinson, H. Russell, *Oriental Armour*, London, 1967.

- Rogers, J. M., 'The Date of the Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzerum', *Kunst des Orients* 8, 1-2 (1972), 77-119.
- 'Recent Work on Seljuk Anatolia', *Kunst des Orients* 6, 2 (1969), 134-69.
- 'Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia: the Epigraphic Evidence', *Anatolian Studies* 26 (1976), 69-103.
- Roillard, G., *La vie rurale dans l'empire byzantin*, Paris, 1953.
- Roquebert, M., *Histoire des Cathares: hérésie, croisade, inquisition du XIe au XIVe siècle*, Paris, 1999.
- Roxburgh, David J. (ed.), *Turks: a Journey of a Thousand Years, 600-1600*, London, 2005.
- Ruben, W., 'Kırşehir'in Dikkatimizi Çeken Sanat Abideleri', *Belleten* 44, 11 (1947), 603-40.
- Rudlov-Hille, Gertruda and Otto Rudlov, 'Grad Plovdiv i Negovite Sgradi', *Izvestija na Bălgarskija Arheologičeski Institut* 8 (1934), 379-425.
- Runciman, S., *The Fall of Constantinople 1453*, Cambridge, 1961, repr. 1965.
- A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1951-4.
- Le Manichéisme médiéval*, Paris, 1949.
- The Sicilian Vespers*, Cambridge, 1958.
- Russell, Josiah Cox, *Medieval Regions and Their Cities*, Newton Abbot, 1972.
- Sahillioğlu, Halil, 'The Role of International Monetary and Metal Movements in Ottoman Monetary History 1300-1750', in *Precious Metals and the Later Medieval and Early Modern Worlds*, ed. J. F. Richards, Durham, N.C., 1983.
- Şahin, Faruk, 'Kütahya Çini-Keramik Sanatı ve Tarihinin Yeni Buluntular Açısından Değerlendirilmesi', *Sanat Tarihi Yılı 9-10* (1981), 259-86.
- Şahin, İlhan, 'XV ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı Taşra Teşkilatının Özellikleri', in *XV ve XVI. Asırları Türk Asrı Yapan Değerler*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, İstanbul, 1999, pp. 123-30.
- Sakin, O., 16. *Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Türkmenler ve Yörükler*, İstanbul, 2006.
- Saman Doğan, Nermin, 'The Figural Representations of the Karamanid Period: an Iconographic Approach', in *Art turc / Turkish Art. 10th International Congress of Turkish Art / 10e Congres international d'art turc. Genève / Geneva. 17-23 September 1995 / 17-23 Septembre 1995. Actes / Proceedings*, Geneva, 1999, pp. 607-14.
- Sander, E., 'Die Heeresorganisation Heinrichs I', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1939), 1-26.
- Sanjian, A. K., *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301-1480*, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
- Sarre, Friedrich, 'Die Keramik der islamischen Zeit von Milet', in *Das Islamische Milet*, ed. K. Wulzinger, P. Wittek and F. Sarre, Berlin, 1935, pp. 109-88.
- Konya, Seldschukische Baudenkmäler*, Berlin, 1921.
- Sayılı, A., 'Vâcidiye Medresesi, Kütahya'da Bir Ortaçağ Türk Rasathanesi', *Belleten* 12, 47 (1948), 655-66, 667-77.
- Sayılı, Aydın, 'The Wâjidiyya Madrasa of Kütahya: A Turkish Medieval Observatory?', *Belleten* 12 (1948), 666-77.
- Scerrato, Umberto, 'An Early Ottoman Han near Lake Apolyont', *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale de arte turca*, Naples, 1965, pp. 221-34.
- Schaendlinger, C., 'Ämter und Funktionen im Reiche der Rumseltschuken nach der "Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi"', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1967), 172-92.
- Schick, I. C. (ed.), *M. Uğur Derman. 65 Yaş Armağanı*, İstanbul, 2006.
- Schilbach, Erich, *Byzantinische metrologie*, Munich, 1970.

- Schimmel, A., 'Some Reflections on Yunus Emre's *Tekerleme*', in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies: Eucharisterion. Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*, ed. Ihor Sevcenko and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk, 3-4, 2 (1979-80), 706-11.
- The Triumphal Sun: a Study of the Works of Jalaloddin Rumi*, Albany, 1993.
- Schlesinger, Walter, 'Herrschaft und Gefolgschaft in der germanisch-deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift* 176, 2 (1953), 225-75.
- Schramm, Gottfried, *Ein Damm bricht. Die römische Donaugrenze und die Invasionen des 5.-7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern*, Munich, 1997.
- Schreiner, Peter, *Philadelphie et autres études*, Paris, 1984.
- 'Zur Geschichte Philadelphieas im 14. Jahrhundert (1293-1390)', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), 375-431.
- 'Eine Zweite Handschrift des "Ordo Portae" und der Wegbeschreibung in das Gebiet des Uzun Hasan. Mit einer Hypothese zur Verfasserfrage', *Südost-Forschungen* 41 (1982), 9-25.
- Şehsuvaroğlu, B. N., *Şâir ve Hekim Ahmedî*, Istanbul, 1954.
- Şeker, M., *Selçuk İsa Bey Camii*, İzmir, 1970.
- Şentürk, Şennur (ed.), *Asya'dan Anadolu'ya Rüzgar*, Istanbul, 1994.
- Serjaceut, R. B., *Islamic Textiles: Materials for a History up to the Mongol Conquest*, Beirut, 1972.
- 'Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest', *Ars Islamica* 10 (1943), 71-104; 11-12 (1946), 98-145; 13-14 (1948), 75-117; 15-16 (1951), 29-85.
- Sertkaya, O. F., Y. Kocasavaş, E. Çetin and Y. Tiryaki (eds.), *Balkanlar'da Türk Mührü*, Istanbul, 1998.
- Şeşen, R., 'Selçuklular Devrindeki İlme Genel Bir Bakış', in *III. Uluslararası Mevlâna Kongresi 5-6 Mayıs 2003, Bildiriler*, Konya, 2004, pp. 233-44.
- Setton, K. M., *Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-88*, Cambridge, Mass., 1948.
- (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, Madison, 1969.
- Sevin, V., 'Mystery Stelae: Are Stone Images Found in Southeastern Turkey Evidence of Early Nomads and a Lost Kingdom?', *Archeology* (July / August 2000), 47-51.
- Sevin, V. and A. Özfirat, 'Hakkari Stelleri: Doğu Anadolu'da Savaşçı Çobanlar', *Belleten* 243 (2001), 501-18.
- Shaw, Stanford J., *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1976.
- Sözen, Metin, *Anadolu'da Akkoyunlu Mimarisi*, Istanbul, 1981.
- 'Anadolu'da Eyvan Tipi Türbeler (The Iwan Type Türbes in Anatolia)', *Anadolu Sanatı Araştırmaları* 1 (1968), 167-210.
- Anadolu Medreseleri*, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1970-3.
- 'Çemişgezek'de Türk Eserleri ve Yelmaniye Camisi', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 4 (1970-71), 29-48.
- Diyarbakır'da Türk Mimarisi*, Istanbul, 1971.
- 'Oba Pazarı Çevresi ve Oba Medresesi', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 1 (1964-5), 143-54.
- Spufford, Peter, *Handbook of Medieval Exchange*, London, 1986.
- Stchoukine, Ivan, 'Miniatures turques du temps de Mohammad II', *Arts Asiatiques* 15 (1967), 47-50.
- Stierlin, Henir, *Turkey: From Selçuks to the Ottomans*, Cologne and London, 2002.
- Stoyanov, Y. Perrin, *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven, 2000.

- Stümer, F., 'Anadolu'da Moğollar', *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1969), 1–147.
- 'Anadolu'ya Yalnız Göçebe Türkler mi Geldi?', *Belleten* 24, 96 (1960), 567–95.
- 'Bozok Tarihine Dair Araştırmalar', *Cumhuriyet'in 50. Yıldönümü Anma Kitabı*, Ankara, 1974, pp. 309–81.
- Çepniler: Anadolu'daki Türk Yerleşmesinde Önemli Rol Oynayan bir Oğuz Boyu, İstanbul, 1992.
- Oğuzlar (Türkmenler), Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları, Ankara, 1972, repr. 1981.
- Selçuklular Devrinde Doğu Anadolu'da Türk Beylikleri, Ankara, 1990.
- 'The Seljuk Turbans and the Tradition of Embalming', in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca*, Naples, 1965, pp. 245–8.
- Yabanlu Pazarı: Selçuklular Devrinde Milletlerarası Büyük Bir Fuar, İstanbul, 1985.
- Svornos, N., *Études sur l'organisation intérieure, la société et l'économie de l'Empire byzantin*, Aldershot, 1973.
- Szabó, János B. (ed.), *Mohács*, Budapest, 2006.
- Székely, György et al., *Turkic–Bulgarian–Hungarian Relations (VIth–XIth Centuries)*, ed. Gy. Káldy-Nagy, Budapest, 1981.
- Tabak, Nermin, *Ahlat Türk Mimarisi*, İstanbul, 1972.
- Taeschner, F., 'Beitrage zur Geschichte der Achis in Anatolien', *Studia Islamica* 4 (1931), 1–47.
- 'Die bürgerliche Futuwwa. Das Achitum im seldchukischen und nachseldchukischen Anatolien', in Franz Taeschner, *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam*, Munich, 1979, pp. 277–402.
- Gülschehr Mesnevî auf Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kirschehir und Patron der türkischen Zünfte, Wiesbaden, 1955.
- 'Die Türbe der İsfendiyaroglu in Sinop', in *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte Asiens in Memoriam Ernst Diez*, ed. Oktay Aslanapa, İstanbul, 1963, pp. 31–3.
- Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam*, Munich, 1979.
- 'Zwei Gazels Von Gülşehri', *Fuat Köprülü Armağanı*, İstanbul, 1953, pp. 479–85.
- Taeschner, F. and P. Wittek, 'Die Vezirfamilie der andarlyzâde (14./15. Jhdt.) und ihre Denkmäler', *Der Islam* 18 (1929), 60–115.
- Tahrallı, M., 'A General Outline of the Influence of Ibn 'Arabî on the Ottoman Era', *Journal of the Muhyî al-Dîn Ibn 'Arabî Society* 26 (1999), 43–54.
- Taneri, A., 'Müsâmeretü'l-ahbâr'ın Türkiye Selçukluları Devlet Teşkilatı Bakımından Değeri', *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 4, 6–7 (1966), 127–71.
- Tanındı, Z., 'Seçkin bir Mevlevî'nin Tezhipli Kitapları', in M. Uğur Derman, *65 Yaş Armağanı*, ed. I. C. Schick, İstanbul, 2006, pp. 513–36.
- Tanyu, H., *Ankara ve Çevresinde Adak ve Adak Yerleri*, Ankara, 1965.
- Tatarlı, İbrahim, 'Turski Kultovi Sgradi i Nadpisi v Bulgarija', *Godišnik na Sofijskija Univerzitet, Fakultet po Zapadni Filologii*, Sofia, 1966, pp. 567–615.
- Tekin, Gönül Alpaz, 'Timur Devrine Ait İki Türkçe Şiir', in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies: Eucharisterion. Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*, eds. Ihor Sevcenko and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk, 3–4, 2 (1979–80), 850–67.
- Tekin, Şinasi, '1343 Tarihli Bir Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Metni ve Türk Dili Tarihinde "Olga-Bolga" Sorunu', *TDAY Belleten* (1973–4), 59–157.
- 'Eski Türk Yazı Dillerinin Özellikleri Üzerine Düşünceler ve Bunların Teşekkülü ile Türk Siyasi Birlikleri Arasındaki İlişkiler', in Şinasi Tekin, *İhtikakçının Köşesi*, İstanbul, 2001, pp. 121–49.

- “Türk Dünyasında Gazâ ve Cihâd Kavramları Üzerine Düşünceler. II. Gâzî Teriminin Anadolu ile Akdeniz Bölgesinde İtibârını Yeniden Kazanması”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, 19, 110 (1993), 73–80.
- ‘XIV üncü Yüzyıla Ait Bir İlmi Hal: Risaletü'l-islam’, in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes: Festschrift Andreas Tietze zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden und Schülern* 76 (1986), 279–92.
- ‘XIV. Yüzyılda Yazılmış Gazilik Tarikası “Gâziliğin Yolları” Adlı Bir Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Metni ve Gazâ/ Cihâd Kavramları Hakkında’, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13 (1989), 139–204.
- Temizel, A., ‘Ahmedî’nin Farsça Eserleri (Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks)’, doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, 2002.
- Tezcan, Hülya and Selma Delibaş, *The Topkapı Saray Museum: Costumes, Embroideries and other Textiles*, tr. and ed. J. M. Rogers, London, 1986.
- Tezcan, S., ‘Anadolu Türk Yazınının Başlangıç Döneminde Bir Yazar ve Çarh-nâme’nin Tarihlendirilmesi Üzerine’, *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 4 (1994), 75–88.
- ‘Manzum Kelile ve Dimne Üzerine Notlar’, *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 6 (1996), 81–121.
- ‘Mes’ûd ve XIV. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Yeni Bilgiler’, *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 5 (1995), 65–84.
- Thiriet, Freddy, *La Roumanie vénitienne au moyen âge. Le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII–XV siècles)*, Paris, 1959, repr. 1975.
- ‘Venise et l’occupation de Ténédos au XIV^e siècle’, *Mélanges de l’École Française de Rome* 65 (1953), 219–45.
- Thorau, P., *The Lion of Egypt: Sultan Baybars I and the Near East in the Thirteenth Century*, tr. P. M. Holt, London and New York, 1992.
- Timurtaş, F. K., *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi*, İstanbul, 1977.
- Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı*, 2 vols., İstanbul, 1990.
- Togan, İ., ‘Ottoman History by Inner Asian Norms’, *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 18, 3–4 (1991), 185–210.
- Togan, Zeki Velidi, ‘Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period’ [1931], tr. G. Leiser, *Annales Islamologiques* 25 (1991), 203–40.
- ‘Moğollar Devrinde Anadolu’nun İktisadi Vaziyeti’, *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası* 1 (1931), 1–42.
- ‘Reşideddin’in Mektuplarında Anadolu’nun İktisadi ve Medeni Hayatına Ait Kayıtlar’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 15, 1–4 (1953–4), 33–49.
- Umumî Türk Tarihine Giriş*, İstanbul, 1970.
- Tomovski, Krum, ‘Djamii vo Bitola’, *Godišen Zbornik na Tehničkiot Fakultet Skopje* 2, 2 (1957), 29–60.
- Toska, Z., ‘Türk Edebiyatında Kelile ve Dimne Çevirileri ve Kul Mesud Çevirisi’, doctoral thesis, İstanbul University, 1989.
- Tuncel, Mehmet, *Babaeski, Kırklareli ve Tekirdağ Camileri*, Ankara, 1974.
- Turan, Osman, *Anadolu Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk-İslâm Medeniyeti*, Ankara, 1965.
- ‘Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks’, in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. I, ed. P. M. Holt, Ann K. S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 248–51.
- Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi: Saltuklular, Mengüçükler, Sökmenliler, Dilmaçoğulları ve Artuklular’ın Siyasi Tarih ve Medeniyetleri*, İstanbul, 1973.

- 'Hristiyanları Tehcir ve İskân Siyaseti', in Osman Turan, *Türk Cihan Hâkimiyeti Mefkûresi Tarihi*, İstanbul, 1969.
- 'Orta Çağlarda Türkiye Kıbrıs Münasebetleri', *Belleten* 28, 109 (1964), 209–27.
- 'Selçuk Kervansarayları', *Belleten* 10, 39 (1946), 471–96.
- 'Selçuk Türkiye'si'nde Faizle Para İkrasına Dair Hukuki Bir Vesika', *Belleten* 16, 62 (1952), 251–60.
- 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri I: Şemseddin Altun-Aba Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı', *Belleten* 11, 42 (1947), 197–235.
- 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri II: Mübarizeddin Er-Tokuş ve Vakfiyesi', *Belleten* 11, 43 (1947), 415–29.
- 'Selçuklu Devri Vakfiyeleri III: Celaleddin Karatay, Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri', *Belleten* 12, 45 (1948), 17–170.
- Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, İstanbul, 1971.
- 'Selçuklularda Toprak Hukuku. Miri Topraklar ve Hususi Mülkiyet Şekilleri', *Belleten* 12, 47 (1948), 549–74.
- Turan, Şerafettin, *Türkiye-İtalya İlişkileri I Selçuklar'dan Bizans'ın Sona Erişine*, İstanbul, 1990.
- Türer, O., 'General Distributions of the Sufi Orders in Ottoman Anatolia', in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2005, pp. 219–60.
- Türkay, C., *Başbakanlık Arşivi Belgelerine Göre Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Oymak, Aşiret ve Cemaatler*, İstanbul, 2001.
- Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, *The Anatolian Civilizations*, vol. III: *Seljuk and Ottoman*, İstanbul, 1983.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Dahiliye Vekaleti, *Son Teşkilât-ı Mülkiyede Köylerimizin Adları*, İstanbul, 1928.
- Ülgen, A. S., 'İznik'te Türk Eserleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 1 (1938), 53–69.
- 'Kırşehir'de Türk Eserleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), 253–61.
- Ülken, H. Z., 'École vudjudite et son influence dans la pensée turque', *Weiner Zeitschrift für der Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1969), 195–208.
- Ülkütaşır, Ş., 'Sinop'ta Candaroğulları Zamanına Ait Tarihi Eserler', *Türk Tarih, Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi* 5 (1949), 112–51.
- Uluçay, C., *Saruhan Oğulları ve Eserlerine Dair Vesikalar*, 2 vols., İstanbul, 1940–6.
- Ünal, Rahmi Hüseyin, *Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d'Erzurum et de sa region*, Paris, 1968.
- Unan, F., 'Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Eğitim', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 389–400.
- Ursinus, Michael, 'An Ottoman Census Register for the Area of Serres of 859 (1454/55)', *Südost-Forschungen* 45 (1986), 25–36.
- Uydu-Yücel, Muallâ, 'Balkanlar'da Peçenek, Oğuz ve Kumanlar', in *Balkanlar El Kitabı*, ed. Osman Karatay and Bilgehan A. Gökdağ, Ankara, 2006, pp. 184–214.
- Uysal, Ali Osman, *Afyon'da Üç Eser*, Ankara, 1992.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Afyon Karahisar, Sandıklı, Bolvadin, Çay, İsaklı, Manisa, Birgi, Muğla, Milas, Peçin, Denizli, Isparta, Atabey ve Eğridir'deki Kitabeler ve Sahip, Saruhan, Aydın, Menteşe, İnanç, Hamit Oğulları Hakkında Malumat*, İstanbul, 1929.

Bibliography

- Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, Ankara, 1988, repr. 1998, 2003.
- 'Gazi Orhan Bey Vakfiyesi 724 Rebiülevvel –1324 Mart', *Belleten* 5 (1941), 277–88.
- 'İbrahim Bey'in Karaman İmaretı Vakfiyesi', *Belleten* 1 (1937), 56–145.
- Kütahya Şehri*, İstanbul, 1932.
- 'Öndört ve Onbeşinci Asırlarda Anadolu Beyliklerinde Toprak ve Halk İdaresi', *Belleten* 2 (1938), 99–106.
- Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları*, vol. I: *Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı*, Ankara, 1984.
- Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları*, vol. II: *Cebeci, Topçu, Top Arabacıları, Humbaracı, Lâğımcı Ocakları ve Kapukulu Süvarileri*, Ankara, 1984.
- 'Osmanlı Hükümdarı Çelebi Mehmed Tarafından Verilmiş Bir Temliknâme ve Sasa Bey Ailesi', *Belleten* 3, 11–12 (1939), 389–99.
- Osmanlı Tarihi*, 2 vols., Ankara, 1988.
- 'Osmanlılarda İlk Vezirlere Dair Mütalea', *Belleten* 3, 9 (1939), 99–106.
- 'XII. ve XIII. Asırlarda Anadolu'daki Fikir Hareketleri ile İctimai Müesseselere Bir Bakış', *III. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 15–20 Kasım 1943, Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler*, Ankara, 1948, pp. 287–306.
- Ünal, Rahmi Hüseyin, 'Çeşme Köyü Camisi (Çeşme / İzmir)', *Arkeoloji – Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* 4 (1988), 117–23.
- Erzurum Yakutiye Medresesi*, Ankara, 1992.
- Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d'Erzerum et de sa region*, Paris, 1968.
- 'Monuments islamiques pré-Ottomans de la ville de Bayburt et de ses environs', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 40 (1972), 99–127.
- Varlık, Mustafa Çetin, *Germiyan-Oğulları Tarihi (1300–1429)*, Ankara, 1974.
- Vásáry, István, *Cumans and Tatars: Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185–1365*, Cambridge, 2005.
- Vasić, Milan, 'Die Martolosen im Osmanischen Reich', *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 2 (1964), 172–89.
- Martolosi u jugoslovenskim zemljama pod turskom vladavinom*, Sarajevo, 1967.
- Vasiliev, A. A., *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, 2 vols., Paris, 1932, repr. 1969.
- 'Manuel Comnenus and Henry II Plantagenet', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929–30), 233–44.
- Vitray-Meyerovitch, Eva de, *Mystique et poésie en Islam: Djalâl-ud-Dîn Rûmî et l'Ordre des Derviches Tourneurs*, Paris, 1972.
- Vladimirtsov, B. Y., *Moğolların İctimai Teşkilâtı. Moğol Göçebe Feodalizmi*, tr. Abdülkadir İnan, Ankara, 1944.
- Vryonis, S., *Byzantium: Its International History and Relations with the Muslim World*, London, 1971.
- 'Byzantium: the Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2 (1959), 159–75.
- The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley, 1971.
- 'Isidor Glabas and the Turkish Devshirme', *Speculum* 31 (1956), 433–43.
- 'Laonicus Chalcocondyles and the Ottoman Budget', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 7 (1976), 423–32.

Bibliography

- 'Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor', *Dumbarton Oaks* 29 (1975), 41–71.
- 'The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki', in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantium and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. A. Bryer and H. Lowry, Birmingham and Washington, DC, 1986, pp. 281–321.
- 'The Question of Byzantine Mines', *Speculum* 37 (1962), 1–17.
- Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks and Ottomans*, Malibu, 1981.
- Watabe, Royoko, 'The Local Administration of the Ilhanid Dynasty: a Case of Fars', *Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 12 (1997), 185–216.
- Wenskus, Reinhard, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*, Cologne and Graz, 1961.
- Werner, Ernst, *Die Geburt einer Grossmacht – Die Osmanen (1300–1481). Ein Beitrag zur Genesis des türkischen Feudalismus*, Weimar, 1985.
- 'Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa und Orhan', *Byzantinoslavica* 26 (1965), 255–76.
- Whelan, Estelle, 'A Contribution to Dānishmendid History: the Figured Copper Coins', *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 25 (1980), 133–66.
- Winnifrith, T. J., *The Vlachs: the History of a Balkan People*, London, 1995.
- Wittek, Paul, 'De la défaite d'Ankara à la prise de Constantinople', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 12 (1938), 1–34.
- 'La descendance chrétienne de la dynastie Seljouk en Macedoine', *Echos d'Orient* 30 (1934).
- 'Deux chapitres de l'histoire des Turcs de Roum', *Byzantion* 11 (1936), 285–319.
- 'Devshirme and Shari'a', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 17, 2 (1955), 271–8.
- 'Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden (I–VII)', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 53 (1957), 300–13; 54 (1958), 240–56; 55 (1959), 122–41; 56 (1960), 267–84; 57 (1961), 102–17; 58 (1962), 165–97; 59–60 (1963–4), 201–23.
- Das Fürstentum Menteşe, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.–14. Jh.*, Istanbul, 1934.
- 'Les Gagaouzes: les gens de Kaykâûz', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 17 (1952), 12–24.
- Menteşe Beyliği*, Ankara, 1986.
- The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1938.
- 'Yazijioghlu "Ali on the Christian Turcs of the Dobrudja"', *The Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14, 3 (1952), 652–88.
- Wolper, E. S., 'Portal Patterns in Seljuk and Beylik Anatolia', in *Aptullah Kuran İçin Yazılar/Essays in Honour of Aptullah Kuran*, ed. Çiğdem Kafescioğlu and Lucienne Thys-Senocak, Istanbul, 1999, pp. 65–80.
- Woods, John E., *The Aqquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, 2nd edn, Salt Lake City, 1999.
- Wulzinger, K., P. Wittek and F. Sarre (eds.), *Das Islamische Milet*, Berlin, 1935.
- Yahiya, O., *Histoire et classification de l'œuvre d'Ibn Arabî*, 2 vols., Damascus, 1964.
- Yavuz, A. T., 'The Presence of the Sultan's Loggia in Anatolian Seljuk Mosques', in *VI Internationaler Kongress für türkische Kunst, München, 3.–7. September 1979. Kurzfassungen der Kongressreferate*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, Munich, 1987, pp. 362–7.
- Yavuz, K., 'Âşık Paşa', *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (Prof. Dr. Ahmet Bican Ercilasun'a Armağan) 13 (2003), 29–39.
- 'Germiyanogulları'nın Türk Kültür Hayatındaki Yeri', *İlmi Araştırmalar* 1 (1995), 167–74.
- 'Mu'îni'nin Mesnevî-i Murâdiyyesi', 2 vols., doctoral thesis, Istanbul University, 1977.

- 'XIII–XVI. Asır Dil Yadigârlarının Anadolu Sahasında Türkçe Yazılış Sebepleri ve Bu Devir Müelliflerinin Türkçe Hakkındaki Görüşleri', *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları* 27 (1983), 9–56.
- Yediylidiz, B., *Institution du waqf au XVIIIe siècle en Turquie: étude socio-historique*, Ankara, 1990.
- Yerasimos, Stéphane, *La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les traditions turques: legends d'empire*, Paris, 1990.
- Yetkin, Şerare, *Anadolu'da Türk Çini Sanatının Gelişmesi*, 2nd edn, Istanbul, 1986.
- Historical Turkish Carpets*, Istanbul, 1981.
- 'Türk Çini Sanatından Bazı Önemli Örnekler ve Teknikleri (Some Important Patterns and Techniques of Turkish Tiles)', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 1 (1964–5), 60–102.
- Türk Halı Sanatı*, Istanbul, 1974.
- 'Yeni Bulunan Hayvan Figürlü Halıların Türk Halı Sanatındaki Yeri', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 5 (1972–3), 291–307.
- Yıldız, H. D., *İslâmiyet ve Türkler*, Istanbul, 1976.
- Yinanç, Mükrimin Halil, *Türkiye Tarihi, Selçuklular Devri: Anadolu'nun Fethi*, Istanbul, 1944.
- Yücel, Erdem, 'Ahi Elvan Camii Pencere Kapakları', *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 7 (1976–7), 120–42.
- Yücel, Yaşar, *Kadı Burhaneddin Ahmed ve Devleti (1344–1398)*, Ankara, 1970.
- XIII.–XV. Yüzyıllar Kuzey-Batı Anadolu Tarihi. Çoban-Oğulları Candar-Oğulları Beylikleri, Ankara, 1980.
- Yüksel, H., 'Anadolu Selçukluları'nda Vakıflar', in *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurlığı I (Sosyal ve Siyasal Hayat)*, ed. A. Y. Ocak, Ankara, 2006, pp. 309–28.
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., 'From Avlona to Antalya: Reviewing the Ottoman Military Preparations of the 1380s', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380–1699)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1996, pp. 227–32.
- 'The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of the Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area', *Studi Medievali*, 3rd ser., 21 (1980), 621–38.
- 'The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 211–18.
- 'Contribution à l'histoire du sud-est de la mer Egée', *Symmeikta* 1 (1966), 211–20.
- 'The Emirate of Karasi and that of the Ottomans: Two Rival States', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, ed. E. A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 1993, pp. 225–36.
- 'Gazi Çelebi of Sinope', in *Oriente e occidente tra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pitarino*, vol. II, ed. Laura Balletto, Genoa, 1997, pp. 1271–5.
- 'Histoires et legends des premiers Ottomans', *Turcica* 27 (1995), 45–89.
- 'Holy War in the Aegean during the Fourteenth Century', in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, eds. Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton and David Jacoby, London, 1989, pp. 212–25.
- 'Οἱ Χριστιανοὶ Ἀπογόνοι τοῦ Ἰλζεδδίν Καϊκαοῦς Β' στὴ Βέροια', *Μακεδονικά* 6 (1964/5), 62–74.
- 'Les "janissaires" de l'empereur byzantin', in *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, ed. Aldo Gallotta and Ugo Marazzi, Naples, 1982, pp. 591–7.
- 'Lauro Quirini and the Turkish Sandjaks (ca. 1430)', *Journal of Turkish Studies* 11 (1987), 239–47.
- 'Manuel II on the Strife between Bayezid I and Kadi Burhan al-Din Ahmad', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), 471–81.

Bibliography

- 'Notes on the Subaşı and the Early Sancakbeyis of Gelibolu', in *Kapudan Pasha: his Office and his Domain*, ed. Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, Rethymnon, 2002, pp. 61–8.
- 'Ottoman Documents from the Archives of Dionysiou (Mont Athos) 1495–1520', *Südost-Forschungen* 30 (1971), 23–7.
- 'Prix et marchés des céréales en Roumanie (1343–1405)', *Nuova Rivista Storica* 61 (1977), 291–306.
- Romania and the Turks (c.1300–c.1500)*, London, 1985.
- 'Συμβολή στην ιστορία του Νοτιοανατολικού Αιγαίου', *Σύμμεκτα* 1 (1966), 184–230.
- 'S'enrichir en Asie Mineure au XIV^e siècle', in *Hommes et Richesses dans l'empire byzantin*, vol. II: VIII^e–XV^e siècle, ed. V. Kravari, J. Lefort and C. Morrison, Paris, 1992, pp. 215–24.
- 'Süleyman Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles', *Der Islam* 60 (1983), 268–96.
- Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415)*, Venice, 1983.
- (ed.), *Kapudan Pasha: his Office and his Domain*, Rethymnon, 2002.
- (ed.), *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)*, Rethymnon, 1993.
- (ed.), *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380–1699)*, Rethymnon, 1996.
- Zaimov, Jordan, *Bitolski Nadpis na Ivan Vladislav Samodirâec Bălgarski*, Sofia, 1970.
- Zajaczkowski, Ananiasz, 'Materialy do epigrafiki osmansko-tureckiej z Bulgarii', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 26, 2 (1963), 7–47.
- Zakythinos, D. A., *Le despotat grec de Morée. Histoire politique*, rev. edn by Ch. Maltezos, 2 vols., London, 1975.
- Zhukov, K. A., *Egeiskie emiraty v XIV–XV vv*, Moscow, 1988.
- Zirojević, Olga, *Tursko vojno uredjenje u Srbiji (1459–1683)*, Belgrade, 1974.
- Zombou-Asimi, Anna, 'Bey Hamam, Thessaloniki, Greece', in *Secular Architecture in the Balkans, 1300–1500*, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjitriphonos, Thessalonike, 1997, pp. 318–21.
- Żygulski, Zdzisław, *Stara broń w polskich zbiorach*, Warsaw, 1982.

Index

- Abaqa Han, Ilkhan ruler (1265–82), 64–73
 death (1282), 73
 and Karamanid revolt, 70–1
 and Mesud, 72
- ‘Abd al-Laif b. ‘Abdallah, mosque in Mardin, 284
- ‘Abd al-Wajid b. Muhammad, scholar, 300
- Abdülaziz, Sultan (1861–76), 309
- Abdülhamid II, Sultan (1876–1909), 309
- Abdülkadir b. Gaybi al-Maragi, *Maqasid al-Alhan*, 321
- Abdullah b. Mahmud, craftsman, 348
- ‘Abdüllatif el-Bağdâdi, scholar, 414
- Abdülmecid b. Isma‘il Herevi (d. 1142), 384
- Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, craftsman, 347
- Abışga, Mongol commander, 82, 85, 88, 90
- Abu al-Fada‘il Muhi al-din, poet, 416
- Abu Ishak al-Thalabi, *Qisas al-Ambiya*, 410
- Abu Najb al-Suhrawardi, Sufi mystic, 393
- Abu Safi‘id Khudabanda, 272
- Abu Sa‘id, Mongol sultan in Anatolia (1317–1335), 90, 92, 93, 122, 267
- Abu Said Bahadur Han, 316
- Abusammed b. Abdurrahman (d. 1145), scholar, 384
- Abu‘l-Fida, Mamluk historian, 328
- Acem, Persia, 343
- Achaia, principality of, and Byzantium, 39
- Adana, recaptured by Byzantium, 17
- ‘Adi b. Musafir (d. 1162), *şeyh*, 387
- Adorno, Giovanni, Genoese tax farmer, 257
- Adrianople *see* Edirne
- Adrianople, battle near (1205), 24
- Aegean islands, Turkish raids on, 233
- Affeddin el-Tilemsani, Sufi, 395
- Afyon, 61, 161
 Ak Mescid, 281
 Kubbeli Mescid, 279
- ağa, head of janissary corps, 207
- Ağaceri, Mongol commander and emir, 89
- agriculture, 12, 121
 effect of rebellions on, 236–7
 effect of Turkoman raids on, 234–7
 means to retain peasants for, 238–9, 258
 products, 239–40, 370, 372
 and Turkish settlement, 370–1
 Turkoman view of, 234–40
see also pastoralism
- Agrilu, 91
- Ahi Evren, Sufi, 375, 398
 and *Keramat-i Ahi Evren* treatise, 417
- ahilik*, 245, 375, 375n.55
- ahis* (religious artisan brotherhoods), 106, 161, 187
 beylik of Karaman, 115
 and mosque complexes, 297
 role in towns, 245
- Ahlat, 374
 tomb of Erzen Hatun, 307
- Ahmad Tegüder, Mongol khan (1282–4), 73, 74
- Ahmed III, Ottoman sultan (1703–30), 178
- Ahmed b. Sa‘d el-Erzincani, *Kitab al-Lata‘f al-‘Ala‘iyya*, 421
- Ahmed Eflaki, *Manakib al-Arifin*, 421
- Ahmed Lakuşi, *vezir*, 90, 98
- Ahmed, Fakih, poet, 409
Çarhaname, 418
Kitabu Evsaf-i Mesacidi’s-Serife, 418
- Ahmed-i Dai, poet and scholar, 411, 418–19
Camasbname, 419
Çengname, 419
Divan, 419
- Ahmed-i Yesevi, use of Turkish language, 409
- Ahmedi, poet, 418
 İskendername chronicle, 132, 322, 418
- Ak Manastır (Deyr-i Eflatun) monastery, 405
- Ak Viran (Avren, Momino), 152

- Akbal, son of Urukto Noyan the Celayirid, 84
- Akbuğa, Celayirid emir, 77, 79, 81
- Akcaalan, pottery kilns, 338
- Akçe Kazanlık, 162
- akın* (raid), 192
- akıncıs* (raiders), in marcher districts, 205
- Akkoyunlu, Turkoman confederation, 97, 268, 273
- occupation of Erzurum (1465), 273
- Aksaray, 258
- carpets from, 233, 243, 328
- Geyhatu's advance to, 76
- Turkoman palace at, 311
- Zincirli Medrese, 298
- Aksaray, battle of (1256), 57
- Akşehir, 238, 374, 388
- cloth manufacture, 243
- Ferruh Şah mosque, 279
- medreses* at, 65
- tomb of Seyyid Mahmud Hayrani, 308
- Akşehir, battle near (1299), 84
- Aladağ, battle of (1338), 94
- Aladağ, Greater Armenia, Ilkhanid summer court at, 52, 62
- coronation of Geyhatu at, 79
- Alaeddin, son of Feramuraz, 72
- Alaeddin Ali (d.1380), 96
- Alaeddin Ali Bey (1366–80), ruler of Eretna, 96
- Alaeddin Bey (d.1331), as patron, 320
- Alaeddin Kaşani, scholar, 413
- Alaeddin Keykubad I, Seljuk sultan (1220–37), 26, 53, 260, 358
- poetry, 416
- and Sufism, 392
- and trade, 373
- Alaeddin Keykubad III, Seljuk sultan (1284, 1292–3, 1301–3), 55, 84, 85, 87
- murdered on mission to Möngke, 56, 57
- Alaeddin Savi, *vezir*, 88, 89
- Alans
- defeat by Ottomans (1302), 119
- as mercenaries in Byzantium, 32
- Alanya (ʿAlaʿiyya, Alaiye), 79, 374
- caravansary, 314
- markets, 249, 250
- Albania
- Byzantine campaign against, 144
- and Ottomans, 136
- destruction of Ottoman monuments, 157
- Ottoman tax register, 134, 156
- Turkish expansion into, 41, 128
- Aleppo
- Ayyubid architecture, 286
- captured (1260), 59
- Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118), Byzantine emperor, 11–15
- and First Crusade, 14
- Alexios II Komnenos (1180–3), Byzantine emperor, 20
- Alexios III Angelos (1195–1203), Byzantine emperor, 22, 24, 25, 234
- Alexios IV Angelos (1203–4), 22
- imprisonment of merchants, 260
- Alexios V Doukas (1204), 22
- Alexios, false, rebellion, 234, 236
- Alexios, ruler of Trebizond, partial rule in Byzantium, 24
- Alexios Axouch, *protostrator* under Manuel I, 50
- Alexios Strategopoulos, capture of Constantinople (1261), 28
- Ali b. Hacı Ahmed, craftsman, 342, 350
- Ali b. İlyas Ali *see* Nakkaş Ali
- Ali b. Muhammed b. Hibetullah el-Buhari, scholar, 414
- Ali b. Ömer Karahisari, 148
- Ali Bey, son of Kara Timurtaş Paşa, as patron, 320
- Ali Padişah, administrator, 89, 94
- Alincak Noyan, 62
- supporter of Rükneddin, 59
- Alişiroğulları, Turkomans from Kütahya, 89
- Alp Arslan I, Seljuk sultan (1063–72), 1, 10, 356
- Alp Arslan II, Seljuk sultan, Manuel I's expedition against, 20
- alps* (warrior leaders), 193
- alum
- production and trade, 242
- taxes on, 257
- trade restrictions, 263, 264
- Amadeo of Savoy, the Green Count, 37
- crusade of, 37, 127
- Amastris (Amasra), 25
- Amasya (Amaseia), 268, 373
- Bayezid Paşa Camii, 348
- Bimarhane medrese, 298
- as centre of *beylerbeyilik*, 204
- illustrated manuscripts, 322
- Ottoman buildings, 274
- Amasyalı Sufi Bayezid, tutor of Mehmed I, 320
- Amid *see* Diyarbakır
- ʿAmr b. al-Farid, *Qasīde-i Taʿiyya*, 421
- Anadolu Hisarı complex, Bosphorus, 131

- Anadolu Hüseyin, Bulgaria, 153
 Anadolulu, Bulgaria, 153
 Anatolia, 1, 354–60
 administration, 83–4
 administrative division, 75
 beylerbeylik of, 204
 Christianity in, 66, 355, 381
 direct Mongol rule (1295–1335), 81–93
 ethnic structure, 360–5
 mineral resources, 240–2, 254
 Mongol troops in, 62
 Muslim *timar*-holders, 199
 society, 365–7
 state policy towards non-Muslims, 387–90, 403
 and Turkoman nomad economy, 230
 Turkoman settlements, 356–8
 under Byzantium, 355
 under Seljuks, 356–7
 use of term, 354n.3
 westernisation, 354
 see also Asia Minor; Ilkhanid state
 Anbarji, son of Möngke Temür, 79
 ancestor cult, Turkic, 163
 Anchialos
 Byzantine occupation, 37
 taken by Bulgars, 33
 Andronikos, son of Manuel II, ruler of
 Thessalonike, 46, 47
 Andronikos I Komnenos (1183–5), Byzantine
 emperor, 20, 21
 Andronikos II, Byzantine emperor
 (1282–1328), 31–3
 and Mongol leader Ghazan, 88
 war with grandson, 33, 144
 Andronikos III, Byzantine emperor (1328–41),
 33, 144
 and Ottoman threat to İzmit, 121–2
 Andronikos IV (1373–9)
 as emperor, 38
 revolts against John V (1373), 38, 39
 Andronikos Doukas, son of Caesar John
 Doukas, 10
 Angelico, Fra, *Enthroned Madonna with Saints*,
 332
 Anhegger, Robert, 181, 288
 Ani, Byzantine annexation, 7
Anis al-Kulub, mesnevi, 416
 Ankara (Ancyranum), 113, 204, 373
 Arslanhane Camii, 348
 Kızıl Bey Mescidi, 348
 mausoleum of Ahi Şeraffedin, 348
 taken by Ottomans (by 1380s), 122, 125
 tomb of Yürük Dede, 307
 Türbe of Hacı Bayram Veli, 348
 Ankara, battle of (1402), 2, 45, 125, 130
 Serbian cavalry at, 217
 Anna Komene, chronicler, 139
 Anna of Savoy, 33, 34
 Ansbert, historian, 139
 Antalya (Attaleia), 25, 109, 112, 373
 annexed by Ottomans, 126, 254
 buildings, 269
 Hamidid Yivli Minare Camii, 288
 tomb of Tekeoğulları (1377), 112
 tomb of Zincirkıran Mehmed Paşa, 306
 markets, 241, 252
 international market, 249, 373
 slave market, 250
 port, 358
 export of carpets from, 233
 shipbuilding, 243
 resettlement of, 258
 Seljuk attack on, 25
 silk brocades, 325
 Turkoman siege (1147), 235
 Venice and, 26
 Antioch
 Byzantine campaign to recover, 16
 first crusade at, 15
 Antonius, archbishop of Larissa (1360), 153, 173
 Apolyont, Lake, Issız Han, 314
 Aqsara'i, chronicler, 65, 83, 88, 98, 228
 Arabs
 sources, 228
 as threat to Byzantium, 6
 see also Islam
 Arap, son of Samağar, 74, 82, 90
 architects, 320
 architecture
 Byzantine cloisonnée technique, 161
 decoration
 faience, 317, 339–41
 painted, 322–4
 hans (caravansarys), 161
 military, 176
 Mongol, in Erzurum, 90
 problems of conservation, 157–8
 Seljuk sultanate, 65
 and town planning, 267–77
 architecture, beylik and early Ottoman, 106,
 110, 112, 277–320
 Aydın beylik, 111
 civil and commercial, 311–16
 decoration, 317–18
 Germiyan beylik, 113

- materials, 316–17
- mosques, 116
- Orhan, 124
- palaces, 311–13
- patronage, 318–20
- roofs, 317
- tombs, 305–11
- Turkoman styles, 277–9
- vaulting, 318
- see also *medreses*; mosques
- architecture, Ottoman, 120, 190–1
 - in the Balkans, 156–91
 - Bayezid, 131
 - destruction after fall of Ottoman Empire, 157
- archons*, rebellion against Palaeologoi, 40
- Arghun, Mongol Ilkhan leader (1284–91), 74, 77–8
 - policy of divide and rule, 74–6
- Arghun Aqa, representative of Möngke, 56
- Argos, city of, 42
 - taken by Turks, 43
- Arik, Oluş, 278
- aristocracy, Byzantium, 20
- Armenia
 - Byzantine annexation, 9
 - Greater, 52
 - trade routes through Taurus, 115
- Armenians, 6
 - in Byzantine army, 10
 - in eastern Anatolia, 361
 - in Erzincan, 243
 - and Mongols, 389
 - tolerance of, 388
 - in towns, 376
- armour
 - coat of mail (*cebe* or *cevşen*) (timariot), 201
 - coat of mail (*ton*), 194
 - imported, 219n.119
 - mail-and-plate (*bürüme*), 201
- armourers, 210
- Arnavud Belgrad see Berat
- Arpa Ke'ün, Mongol Ilkhan in Anatolia, 94
- Arslan Doğmuş, Atabekiyye of, 58, 65
- artillery, 49, 218–19, 241n.99
 - for siege warfare, 222
- artillery corps, 209–10
- arts, 320–51
 - beyliks, 110
 - carpets, 328–36
 - ceramics, 336–46
 - Islamic Anatolian, 106
 - Ottoman, 120, 129
 - painting, 321–4
 - Seljuks of Rum, 266
 - textiles, 324–8
 - Timurid, 266, 343
 - traditions, 266–7
 - woodcarving, 346–51
 - see also architecture; ceramics; literature
- Artuk, *beys* of, 357
- Artukid state, and Islam, 383
- Artukids
 - tolerance of non-Muslims, 388
 - Turkish language, 407
- Artze, commercial centre, 9n.15
- Arvanid, Albania, Christian *timar*-holders, 199
- ascetism (*zühd ve takva*), 390
- Asen, emperor of Bulgaria (1187), 21
- al-Ashraf Khalil, Mamluk sultan, 79
- Asia Minor
 - Byzantine fortresses, 31
 - Byzantium in, 6, 7, 21
 - Manuel I and, 19
 - Ottoman campaign (1390 and 1391), 39
 - Seljuk sultanate of Rum, 11, 13
 - see also Anatolia
- Aşık Ali Paşa, poet, 397–8, 408, 408n.128, 418
 - Fakrname*, 418
 - Garibname* (1330), 194, 397, 418
- Aşıkpaşazade, Ottoman chronicler, 105, 113, 117
 - gaps, 120
 - on market taxes, 252
 - on Osman, 120, 245
 - and Ottoman architecture, 274
 - on Ottoman deportations, 149, 151
 - on Ottomans in Thrace, 145
 - slave prices, 252
 - on Timurid cultural influence, 343
- askeri* (military class), 216
- Aslanapa, Oktay, 278
- astronomy, 420
- Ateş, A., 420
- Athens
 - capture of Acropolis, 42
 - Catalans in, 32
- Atman see Osman
- Atarmytion (Edremit), fortifications, 20, 236
- Attaleia see Antalya
- Attila the Hun, 138
- avarız defters* (registers of Ottoman extraordinary revenue levies), 140
- Avars, 138
 - in Pannonia, 7
- Avnik, siege of (1340), 95
- Axouchs family, 50

- Aya Yorgi (Saint George), festival of, 402
 Ayas, Cilicia, 91
 Ayasoluk (Ephesus), 133, 270
 congregational mosque (1375), 270
 İsa Bey Camii (1374), 111, 284, 290, 317, 318, 319, 340
 Aydın, beylik of, 27, 111, 267
 annexed by Bayezid, 43, 223
 architecture, 270
 arts, 319
 counterfeit Venetian coinage in, 247
 fall of (1282), 233
 and grain trade, 240
 growing power of, 34
 independence, 45
 market taxes, 253
 mercenaries with Catalans, 143
 port of, 250
 relations with Byzantium, 111
 silk production, 325
 slave market, 250
 tax farming, 257
 trade with Latin states, 261, 262
 weights and measures, 246
 Aydınoğlu dynasty, 170
 Ayntab (Gaziantep), town, 374
 Ayşe Hatun, wife of Geyhatu, 78
 Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakki, 278, 288
azabs (militia), 211–12
 archers, 211
 Azerbaijan, 363
 Aziz b. Ardashir-i Astarabadi, *Bazm o Razm*, 421
 Azize Hatun, wife of İsa Bey, 319
 Azizeddin, *beylerbeyi*, 76
 Baba İlyas-ı Horasani (Baba Resul)
 cult of, 402
 revolt (1239–40), 64, 359, 368, 398
 Baba Kemal-i Hocendi, Sufi, 392
 Baba Tuğrai, *vezir*, 58
 debts to Mongols, 60, 71
 Babai rebellion (1239–40), 64, 359, 368, 398
 Shi'i messianism in, 386
 Babinger, Franz, 162, 380
 Babuq, Mongol commander, 96
 Badieddin al-Tabrizi, *Dilsizname*, 321
 Badoer, Giacomo, Venetian merchant, 228, 248
 Baghdad, Mongol attack on, 58, 59, 61
 Bahadır, son of Hüsameddin Bicar, 66
 Bahaeddin Kani'i, poet, 416
 Bahaeddin Veled, Mevlana, Sufi mystic, 391, 392
 Kitab al-Ma'arif, 420
 Badaeddin Paşa b. Hızır, religious
 foundations at Serres, 148
 Baibars, Mamluk sultan, 59, 66, 67
 diplomatic links with Mongol Anatolia, 67
 and Seljuk revolt (1276), 69
 Baibars al-Mansuri, Mamluk historian, 57
 Baidu, Mongol Ilkhan in Anatolia (1295), 81
 candidate for Mongol Han, 78, 81
 Baiju, Mongol general, 57
 invasion of Rum (1256), 61
 at Konya, 58
 at Köseadağ (1243), 53, 54
 move to Anatolia, 57
 Balaban (Domenico Doria), Genoese
 merchant, 232
 Balak Gazi, Artukid ruler, 388
 Balat (Miletus)
 caravansarys, 314
 İlyas Bey Camii, 280–1, 283, 317
 port, 250
 export of carpets from, 233
 metal imports, 242
 pottery, 338
 Balbi, Domenico, trader, 259
 Baldwin, count of Flanders, as emperor in, 23
 Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, 19
 Baldwin II, Latin emperor, 30
 Balik, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
 Balıkesir (Balıkesir)
 division of beylik of Karası, 109
 town of, 271
 Balkans
 Byzantine influence, 8
 coastal beyliks and, 112
 contacts with Anatolian Turks, 141–2, 143
 early Ottoman conquest and, 143–56
 Miletus ware pottery in, 338
 Ottoman deportations to settle, 149–52
 Ottoman military advance into, 121, 122–3
 Ottoman occupation, 37, 126–8, 130, 136, 190
 settlement patterns, 148
 Turkic peoples in, 4, 138–43
 Balkasun, Karamanoğlu mausoleum, 269
 Baltu, son of Nabşı, Mongol commander, 62, 76, 81
 rebellion, 82–3
 Bapheus, battle of (1302), 119, 194
 Barak Bey, at Yenışehir, 153, 173
 Bara'unkar, Mongol branch, 365

- Bari, captured by Normans, 11
 Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, 380
 Barquq, Mamluk sultan, 252
 barter, 248
 Barthold, W., 407
 Bartolo, Domenico di, *The Wedding of the Foundlings*, 333, 334
 Basil II, emperor of Byzantium (976–1025) 7, 8
Battalname epic, 364, 403, 405, 410
 Batu Han, son of Jochi, 54, 55
 influence of, 56
 Bayazid Bistami (d. 874), Sufi, 394
 Bayezid I, Ottoman sultan (1389–1402), 2, 39, 42–3, 129–31
 annexation of Germiyan beylik, 113, 129
 buildings in Bursa, 276, 288, 294, 302
 campaign in western Anatolia, 129
 campaigns in Balkans, 151
 defeated by Timur, 109, 130
 and Karaman, 114, 129
 navy, 224
 as patron, 319
 and resettlement of Verria Turks, 141
 and siege of Constantinople (1390s), 236
 silk textiles, 327
 and trade, 259, 263
 Bayezid II (1481–1512), 168
bedestan (covered market), 259, 313
 Edirne, 172, 313
 Serres, 157, 164
 Skopje (Üsküp), 185
 Bedreddin Murad, leader of Germiyan, 76
 Bektaşî *tarikât* (Sufi order), 384, 387, 394, 397
belles lettres, 421
 Benefatio de Molendino, Venetian merchant, alum trade, 242
 Benevento, battle of (1266), 30
 Berat, Albania, mosque, 174
 Bergama (Pergamon), 25, 109, 271
 fortifications, 20, 236
 Holbein carpets from, 336
 Yıldırım Camii, 288
 Béroé (Stara Zagora), Balkan town, 140
 Bertha of Sulzbach, wife of Manuel I, 17
 beyliks, 107, 267
 in Anatolia, 27, 103
 architecture, 106, 110, 318
 Byzantine legacy, 116
 coastal, 112–13
 compared with Seljuk sultanate, 116–17
 and dominance of Ottomans, 107, 115
 power-sharing between ruling family members, 108–9, 116
 pressure on Byzantium, 359
 resources, 107, 109
 rise of, and towns, 374
 and rise of Ottomans, 125–6
 sea power, 108, 110, 112
 sources for, 105, 108, 110, 111
 Timur's policy towards, 109
 tolerance of Christians, 389
 see also Aydın; Eretna; Germiyan; Hamid; İsfendiyaroğulları; Kadı Burhaneddin; Karaman; Mentеше; Ottoman beylik and Empire; Saruhan; Teke
 Beyşehir
 annexed by Ottomans, 126
 bedestan of Süleyman Bey, 313
 Eşrefoğlu Camii, 286
 Eşrefoğlu capital, 91, 267
 pottery type, 336
 rug from, 335
 town walls, 269
 Turkish town, 374
 Bezirgan Bedreddin, merchant, as patron, 320
Bilad al-Rum, Arab designation of Anatolia, 354
 Bilecik (Bekloma)
 market traders, 245
 nomad trade with, 232
 Orhan Gazi Camii, 279, 281
 bills of exchange, for trade, 248
 Birgi
 Aydınoğlu Gazi Mehmed Bey Türbesi, 317, 340
 as capital of Aydın beylik, 111
 dynastic tombs, 270
 medrese, 270
 palace, 311
 Ulu Cami, 270, 288, 290, 317, 339, 347
 Bithynia
 Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
 Ottoman expansion into, 121
 rebellion against Michael Palaeologos, 31
 Turkish raids in, 13
 Bitlis, town of, 374
 Black Death (from 1348), 145
 Black Sea, trade across, 229, 252
 blockades, 12, 195
 of Constantinople (1453), 224
 see also siege warfare
 Bocanegra, Simon, Doge of Genoa, 263
 Bode, Wilhelm von, 331, 333
 Bogomilism, 382
 Bohemond I, first crusade, 15
 Boniface of Montferrat, 22, 23, 26

- Bonifacio da Sori, Genoese agent to Orhan, 261
- book illustration, 320
- Boris/Michael, tsar of the Bulgars, 138
- Börklüce Mustafa, dervish rebel, 134, 406
- Bosnia, and Ottomans, 128
- Bosnia-Herzegovina, destruction of Ottoman monuments, 157
- Boucicaut, Jean le Meingre, Maréchal, 44
- bows, and arrows (*yay* and *ok*), 194, 201
broad arrow-heads (*bilek/bilik*), 201
- Braničevo, Serbian principality, 140
- brass utensils, 243
- brick
for building, 316, 317
decorative, 317
glazed, 340–1
- Brindisi, battle of (1156), 18
- Broquière, Bertrandon de la, 147, 217, 225, 228
on Bursa, 277, 326
on palace at Konya, 311
on Turkish carpets, 328
on Turkish merchants, 260
on Turkish nomads, 231, 231n.18
- Buddhism, 364
- buffalo, as draught animals, 231
- Buka, *vezir* in Rum, 77
- Bulgaria, 21, 139
aspirations towards Constantinople, 27, 30
Byzantine conquest, 7, 8, 139
Cuman dynasties in, 140
destruction of Ottoman monuments, 157
and John V, 37
Saruhan invasion, 34
subjugated by Bayezid, 43
toponymy, 152–3
Turkish advance on, 37, 127, 144
Turkish colonists in, 152, 155
and 'Varna crisis' (1444), 190
voynuks, 215
- Bulgars, 7, 8, 138
and Byzantium, 6, 31
treaty with Byzantium (1307), 33
- Buonacorso, Niccolo di, *Marriage of the Virgin*, 331
- bureaucrats, in towns, 376
- Burğlu (Uluborlu), 56, 91
Melik's revolt in, 80
- Burhaneddin Muhakkık-ı Tirmizi, Sufi mystic, 391, 393, 420
- burial practices, 163
interments, 306
- Bursa (Prousa, Prusa), 41, 119, 376
architecture, 267, 274–7
At Pazarı quarter, 276
Bey Sarayı, 276, 311
bridges, 277
complexes; Bayezid İmareti, 131, 294;
Murad I's complex and tomb, 163, 276;
Murad II's complex, 276–7, 303–5;
Yeşil Cami/complex, 169, 274, 276,
295–7, 314, 317, 318, 324, 340–3, 350;
Yıldırım complex, 276, 302, 317
hamams, 276
hans; Bey Han (Emir Han), 314; Bezir Hanı of Lala Şahin Paşa, 276; Emir Hanı (Eski Bezzazistan), 276, 314; Geyve Han, 314; İpek Han, 314; Kapan Hanı of Murad I, 276
medreses, 302, 303–5; Lala Şahin Paşa Medresesi
mosques; Alaeddin Bey Camii (1332–3), 276; Hüdavendigar Camii (1385), 129, 294; İl Eri Oğlu Ahmed Bey Mescidi, 274; Koca Naib Camii, 276; Muradiye Camii, 294, 343; Orhan Gazi Camii (1337–39), 124, 160, 276, 317; Şehadet Cami, 168, 171, 276, 317; Ulu Cami, 171, 276, 288, 290, 317, 318, 348
tombs; of Çelebi Mehmed (Yeşil Türbe), 310–11; of Cem Sultan, 345; of Çoban Bey, 309; of Gülçiçek Hatun, 310; Hatuniye Türbesi, 324; mausoleum of Murad I, 163; of Murad II, 310; of Orhan Gazi, 309; of Osman Gazi, 276, 309; of Şehzade Ahmed, 324; of Yıldırım Bayezid, 310
fall of (1404), 45
fall to Orhan (1326), 236
as *sancak* of Murad (1331), 198
markets (*bedestans*), 242, 249n.160, 313
bezzazistan (drapers' market), 276, 326
commercial district, 276
international market, 248
slave market, 250
under Ottomans, 121, 132
silk production, 243, 326
- Byzantine army
defeat at Malazgirt (Manzikert) (1071), 1, 6
and theme system, 7
weakening of, 8, 9, 119
- Byzantine Empire, 6–11, 355
architectural influence, 279, 317
art, 266
end of (1453), 1

- frontiers, 15
 coastal territories, 12
 control over Bulgaria, 139
 pressure on, 8–9, 359
 influence over Christians in Anatolia, 389, 404
 instability in, 8, 11, 31
 civil war (1321–8), 33, 144
 civil war (1341–7/1341–54), 33–5, 39, 144
 civil war (1380s), 128
 palace revolution (1181), 20
 reforms, 12, 20
 restoration under Michael VIII Palaeologos, 29–31
 Komnenoi dynasty, 11–21
 and Latin rule in Constantinople (1204–61), 22–8
 ninth-century expansion, 7–8
 as Ottoman vassal state, 43, 45, 128, 217
 perception of Turks, 227, 362
 and relations with Mongols in Anatolia, 63, 103
 relations with Ottoman, 45, 49–50, 120, 122, 126, 132, 136
 treaty (1403)
 rural life, 370
 and Seljuk sultanate of Rum, 11
see also Constantinople
- Byzantine navy
 rebuilding of, 14, 35
 thirteenth–fourteenth century, 30, 31
 under Vatatzes, 26
 and Venice, 19
 weakening of, 16, 35
- Caffa, Genoese trading settlement, 252
- Cahen, Claude, 229, 230, 363, 373, 383
- Cairo
 mosques, 290
see also Fustat
- Çaka (Tzachas), Turkish emir, 13
- Çaldıran, battle of (1514), 137
- Çalı Bey, Admiral, 224, 251
- Callipolis *see* Gelibolu
- Camah, alum production, 242
- camels, for transport, 220
- Çandarlı Ali Paşa, as patron, 320
- Çandarlı family, as patrons, 320
- Çandarlı Halil Hayreddin Paşa, Ottoman grand vezir (d. 1387), 128, 150, 164, 281, 320
- Çandarlı İbrahim Paşa, mosque in Serres, 164, 320
- Candaroğulları *see* İsfendiyaçoğulları
- caravansarys (*han*), 109, 148
 Antalya, 112
 establishment of, 258n.235, 258–9, 373
 İlica, 161
 at İshkali, 65
 Seljuk, 314
vakıfs for, 377
- Caria, beylik of Menteşe in, 111
- carpets and *kilims*, 328–36, 351
 Anatolian animal type, 331–5
 Berlin Rug, 333
 in European paintings, 331
 exports, 328
 Konya-type, 329–31
 Marby Rug, 334
 nomad trade in, 231, 233
- cash
 replacement of labour services, 255
 for trade, 248
- Catalan Grand Company of mercenaries, 32, 33
 in Gallipoli, 143
 principality in Greece, 32, 41, 42
 in Thrace, 143–4
- Ca'unkar, Mongol branch, 365
- cavalry (*timar eri/sipahis*), 197
 battle tactics, 221
 commanders, 203
 numbers, 209
 salaried, 208–9
 Serbian, 217
 weapons, 217
- Çavul, Emir, 358
- cebeci* (armourer), 210
- Çekirge, Hüdavendigar İmareti, 294, 302
- Celaledin Eye Bey b. Felekeddin, architect, 314
- Celaledin Hoca, official in Anatolia, 90
- Celaledin Karatay, Seljuk official, 65
- Celaledin Muhammed Rumi, Sufi mystic and poet, 58, 63, 65, 84, 359, 390, 392, 393, 405, 417
 and divine, 396–7
Fihi ma fihi, 397, 421
Majalis-i Sab'a, 421
Mektubat, 421
 poetry, 416
- Celayirids, 78
 as threat to Mongols, 93
- Çelebi İshak b. İlyas, Saruhanid ruler, 347
- Çelebi Mehmed, ruler in Bursa, 276, 295, 313, 319

- censuses, Ottoman, 139, 142
 of Süleyman I (the Magnificent) (1528–30), 148–9
- ceramics, 336–46, 351
cuerda seca, 341–2, 344, 345
 cut tile mosaic, 342, 344
 faience, 317, 339–41
 frit wares, 338, 343, 344
 glazed, 340–1
 glazed tiles, 297, 340–3
 ‘Miletus ware’ glazed common, 336–8
 underglaze painted tiles, 344
- cerehōrs* (irregular soldiers), 214–15
- Cesarini, Cardinal Giuliano, leader of Christian forces, 48
- Çetintaş, Sedat, 297
- Chalkokondyles, Laonikos, Ottoman chronicler, 149, 150
 on copper mines, 240
- Charalambos, Saint, 402
- Charles II, king of Naples, 33
- Charles III of Durazzo, overthrow of Queen Joanna, 40
- Charles of Anjou (1265–85), king, 29, 30
- Charles of Valois, 33
- China, influence on pottery, 338, 345
- Chinggis Han, successors of, 53–7
- Chioggia War, 38
- Chios, island, 13, 19
 Maona family of, 261
 monks of, 406
 recaptured by Genoa, 35
 Turkish merchants in, 259
- Chliara (Kırkağaç), fortifications, 20
- Chliat (Ahlat), siege of (1068), 10
- Chonai (Honas), Seljuks at, 25
- Choniates, Niketas, Greek chronicler, 15, 20, 25, 49, 227, 228
 on nomad economy, 230, 236
 on resettlement of captives, 238
- Chormaghun, Mongol general, 53, 54, 58
- Christianity
 in Anatolia, 66, 355, 381
 missionary activity, 359, 381
 in Roman Empire, 355
 theological debates with Islam, 405–18
 and transition to Islam, 401
see also Orthodox Church; Rome, Church of
- Christians
 in Anatolia, 66, 361
 in Balkans, 140, 141
 and conversion to Islam, 403
- in early Ottoman beylik, 120
 as irregular *cerehōr* soldiers, 214
 relations with Muslims, 400
 taxation of, 238, 255
 in Thrace, 146
 as *timar*-holder *sipahis*, 199
 tolerance towards, 388
 Turks as, 140, 364
see also devşirme
- chronicles
Anonymous Chronicles, 105, 135
Anonymous-Giese, 150, 151, 163
 for beylik history, 105
 Byzantine, 104
 Short Chronicles, 104, 145
 ‘Historia Peregrinorum’ (1190), 140
 of Kantakouzenos, 121
 of Karamanoğulları, 105
 Ottoman, 105, 108, 117, 152
İskendername (Ahmedi), 132, 322, 418
Selçukname chronicle, 141
 Seljuk, 134
see also Aşıkpaşazade; Chalkokondyles; Choniates; *Düsturname*; Ibn Battuta; Ibn Bibi
- churches, Christian, converted to mosques, 159, 167
- Çifte Minare Medresesi
 in Erzurum, 76
 in Sivas, 71
- Cilicia, Armenians in, 89
see also Lesser Armenia
- Cimri, and Turkoman revolt (1277–8), 70–1, 386
- Çirmen, battle of (1371), 38, 127, 159
- Clavijo, chronicler, on Erzincan, 273
- Clement IV, Pope, 30
- Clement V, Pope, 33
- Clement VI, Pope, 34
- Clermont, Council of (1095), 14
- cloth *see* silk industry; silk trade; textiles
- Çoban, Emir, 68, 84, 90
 fall of, 92
- Çoban Bey, brother of Orhan Gazi, 320
- Çoban Suldus, senior emir, 89
- Çobanids
 Eretna and, 95
 as threat to Mongols, 93
- coinage
 Antalya, 60
 beyliks, 110, 112

- Germiyan, 113
İsfendiyaroğulları, 116
Karasi, 110
copper, 113, 247
 mangır (Turkish), 247
counterfeit, 247
gold, 247
 hyperpyron (Byzantine), 247
issues
 Demirtaş, 91
 Eretnid, 94, 95, 97
 Ghazan Han, 85
 Mesud, 86
 Orhan, 121, 124
 Osman, 124
 Rükneddin, 58–60
Konya, 60
Lu'lu'a (Lulon), 60
moneys (1299–1300), 102
Ottoman, 121, 124
silver, 247
 akçe (Turkish), 247
 debasement of *akçe* (1449), 137
 dirhem, 247
 Ilkhanid *dirhems*, 102, 119
 Seljuk *dirhems*, 102
Trebizond(ine), 116
variations and exchange rates, 229, 246–8
Venetian ducat, 247
 see also mints
Conrad III, king of Germany, 17, 18
Constance, Council of (1414), 48
Constance of Antioch, 17
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, emperor (905–59), 8
Constantine IX Monomachos, emperor (1042–55), 8, 9
Constantine IX Palaeologos, emperor (1449), 47, 48
 appeals to west, 49
Constantine X Doukas, emperor (1059–67), 10
Constantine of Kostenets, Bulgarian scholar, 176
Constantine the Great, emperor (311–37), 355
Constantino de Groto, merchant, 246
Constantinople, 2, 48
 architecture, 351
 Fatih Mosque, 180, 345, 352
 New Palace (Seraglio), 352
 captured by crusaders (1204), 22
 Genoese siege of (1348), 35
 Ottoman siege (1394–1402), 1, 130, 218, 236
 Ottoman siege (1422), 2, 218
 recaptured by John V (1379), 39
 repopulation by Mehmed II, 244, 258
 siege and fall of (1453), 1, 49, 219, 222
 naval blockade, 224
 taken by John VII (1390), 39
 taken by Michael VIII Palaeologos, 28
 trade, 252, 254
 slave market, 251
 Turkish merchants in, 259
 Turkish *kadı* (judge) in, 259
 Turkish siege (1383–87), 39
 under Latin rule (1204–61), 22–8, 359
copper
 exports, 241
 mines, 240
Corfu (Kerkyra)
 taken by Roger of Sicily, 18, 21
 Venetian attacks on, 16
Corinth
 besieged by Turks, 44
 taken by Roger of Sicily, 18
 wall of Hexamillion, 46, 47, 48
Cornaro of Crete, subject of Venice, 33
Corner, Daniel, Venetian ambassador, 262
Coron (Korone), Venetian rule over, 23, 41
Çorum, Ulu Cami, 348
cotton textiles, 326
Crete
 insurrection, 14
 recaptured by Byzantium, 7
 Venetian possession, 43
 Venetian trade in Turkoman horses, 232
Crimea, trading settlements, 252
Croatia, Hungarian occupation, 21
Croats, 6
crusade of Varna (1444), 136, 152, 190
crusades *see* Amadeo of Savoy; crusade of Varna; Europe; first crusade; fourth crusade; second crusade; third crusade
Culpan, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
cults, pre-Christian, 401
culture
 assimilation, 403
 fusion of Byzantine and Ottoman, 2–3
 intellectual life, 406–21
 Seljuk sultanate, 65
 sources for, 353–4
 Turkish, 400–5, 422
 see also arts; language; literature

- Cumans (Kıpçak), Turkic nomads, 13, 24, 139, 364
 in Balkans, 140
 as Byzantine mercenaries, 362
 Deşti-Kıpçak, 54, 63
 in Meander valley, 28
 Cüneyd Bey, ruler of Aydın, 133, 135, 170, 259
 currency *see* cash; coinage
 customs, pre-Christian, 401
 Cyprus
 captured by Richard Lionheart, 21
 Genoese trade in Turkoman horses, 232
 insurrection, 14
 recaptured by Byzantium, 7
- Dalmatia, Hungarian occupation, 21
 Damalis, Turkish raids in, 13
 Damascus
 Great Mosque, 286, 318
 Umayyad Mosque, 181
 Damsa Köyü (near Ürgüp)
 Taşkın Paşa mosque complex, 272, 348
 Taşkın Paşa palace, 311–13
türbe of Hızır Bey, 307
 Dandanakan, battle of (1040), 356
 Dandolo, Enrico, doge of Venice, 22
 Danişmend bey, Turkoman leader, 357
 Danişmend region, 59, 65
 coins, 247
 Danişmend state, 16
 and Islam, 383
 Seljuks and, 358
 tolerance of Christians, 388
Danişmendname epic, 357, 364, 403, 405
 Danube, Ottoman river fleet on, 225
 Dastgirdani, Cemaleddin, *sahib-i divan*, 83
 David Komnenos, partial rule in Byzantium, 24
 Davud II el-Muzaffer, Artukid ruler, 284
 Davud b. Abdullah, craftsman, 348
defter-i mufassal, 238
defters *see* *tahrir-defters*
 Dehhani, poet, 409, 417
 Dejanović, Constantin, of Velbužd, 154
 Deli Orman, Muslim Turks in, 142
 Demerode, Filippo, agent to Orhan, 261, 263
 Demerode, Giovanni, agent to Murad I, 261
 Demirtaş, son of Çoban, 90–2, 100
 claims to independence, 91
 and father, 91
 Denizli (Ladik), battle of (1289), 76
 Denizli (Laodikeia, Ladik, Donuzlu), 19, 235
 abandoned, 374
 cloth manufacture, 243, 326
 Geyhatu's attack on, 78
 Seljuks at, 25
 Turkish town, 374
 Derman, Cuman nobleman, 140
 dervishes, 376, 391
 in Anatolia, 66, 100
 grants of land for cultivation, 239
 hospice at Mekece, 120
 Mevlevi, 90, 180, 188
see also Sufism; *zaviyes*
Destan chronicle *see* *Düsturname*
 Deşti-Kıpçak Mongols, 54, 63
 Devlet Hatun, wife of Bayezid I, 320
 Devol, treaty of (1108), 15
devşirme (levy of Christian children), 404
 establishment of, 137, 206
 origins of, 124, 126
 Didymoteichon (Dimetoka)
 architecture, 168–70
 Çelebi Sultan Mehmed Camii, 295
 Fısıltı Hamamı, 169
medrese of Uruç Paşa, 170
 Ottoman buildings, 274
türbe of Uruç Paşa, 170
 Yıldırım Bayezid mosque, 168
 captured by Ottomans (1361), 37
 Turkic peoples of, 140
 Turkish occupation of, 123
Dilsizname, 321
 Dımışk Hoca, brother of Demirtaş, 91
 diplomacy
 books of, 421
 Byzantine use of, 7, 12
 Turkish language for, 409
Divan-ı Kebir (*Divan-i Kabir*), 397, 416
 Divriği
 Turan Melik hospital, 298
 Ulu Cami, 286
 Diyarbakır, 374
 Akkoyunlu centre, 273
 independence of, 52
 Ulu Cami, 283
dizdar (fortress captain), 210
 Dobrotić, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
 Dobruca (Dobrudja), Seljuk Turks settled in, 141, 143, 368
 Dokus Hatun, wife of Hülegü, 59
 Dorylaion *see* Eskişehir
 Doukas, Byzantine historian, 224, 227, 228
 on Timur, 230n.11
 Drama, Macedonia, Ottoman control, 151

- Draperio, Francesco, Genoese tax farmer,
 257
 merchant partnership, 242
 Duladay, Mongol emir and *yarghuchi*, 75, 77
 Dulgadiroğulları, 95, 96, 97, 268, 273
 Dülgerzade, Ottoman scholar, 170
 Dunaysir, Ulu Cami, 283
 Dundi Hatun, daughter of Akbuğa, 78
 Dušan, Stefan, king of Serbia (1331–55), 33, 35,
 36, 37, 144
Düsturname chronicle (Enveri), 105, 111
 Dyrrachium (Durazzo)
 battle of (1108), 15
 Norman blockade of, 12
 taken by Philip of Tarentum, 33
- earthquakes
 (1327), 121
 (1353), 145
 (1354), 123
 Skopje (1963), 158
 Thessalonike (1978), 158
 Ebu Abdullah Efdaleddin el-Huneci, 414
 Ebu Said el-Herevi, scholar, 413
 Ebubekr b. Muallim, craftsman, 348
 Ebubekr b. el-Zeki, *Rawdat al-Kuttab wa*
 Hadiqat al-Albab, 421
Ebumüslimname epic, 405, 410
 Ecil, son of Samağar, 90
- economy
 avoidance of disruption, 255–6
 beylik of Germiyan, 113
 beylik of Karaman, 115
 changes, 229–30
 and control of resources, 254–5
 crisis in Byzantium, 31
 devastation by Turkic tribes, 49
 early Ottoman, 119–20
 nomad, 230–4
 Ottoman expansion, 121
 sources for, 104, 228–9
 Turkish approaches to, 3, 265
 see also agriculture; markets; trade
- Edessa, captured by Muslims (1144), 17
 Edirne (Adrianople)
 architecture, 267, 274
 bedestan (covered market), 172, 313
 bridges, 175
 Cisr-i Ergene bridge, 182
 buildings of Murad II, 179–83
 captured by Ottomans, 37, 126
 fall of, 127
 hamams, 182–3
- Alaca Hamam, 182
 (double), 175
 Tahtakale Hamamı, 182
 Yeniçeri Hamamı, 183
 markets, 241, 250
 Mihaloğlu İmaretı, 188
 mosques
 Beylerbey Camii, 179–80, 324
 Fatih Camii, 159
 Gazi Hoca mosque, 179
 Great Mosque (Eski Cami), 159, 171–2,
 288, 318
 Hızır Ağa mosque, 179
 Kilise Cami, 159
 Kirazlı mosque, 179
 Kuşcu Doğan mosque, 179
 Muradiye Cami, 180–1, 188, 318, 324, 343
 Şahmelek mosque, 179, 343
 Saruca Paşa *mescid*, 179
 Selimiye Camii, 294, 324
 Üç Şerefeli Great Mosque (Yeni Cami),
 165, 166, 179, 181–2, 292–4, 317, 318, 324,
 343, 345
 Yeşilce Cami (İmaret of Mezid Bey), 190
 Yıldırım Bayezid mosque (İmaret),
 167–8, 274
 Muradiye Zaviyesi, 295
 and Nicaea, 27
 Orta İmaret (Gazi Mihal Cami), 168, 174–5
 as Ottoman court, 128
 painters at court, 321
 Yeni İmaret, 168
- Edirne province, Muslim Turks (nineteenth
 century), 142
 education, 411–14
 see also intellectual life; *medreses*
 Eflaki (chronicler), 58, 63, 66, 228
 Manakib al-Arifin, 393, 397, 404, 421
 Eğridir, 109, 269
 Hamidid Dündar Bey Medresesi, 298
 Eğridirli Hacı Kemaleddin, *Cami' el-Neza'ir*,
 417
- Egypt
 Seljuks and, 63
 and Turkomans in Anatolia, 92
 see also Fustat; Mamluks
 Ejei (Ajai) brother of Abaqa, Mongol prince,
 62, 67, 76, 78
 Elbistan, battle of (1277), 67, 69
 Elbistan, Dulakadroğlu capital, 273
 Elezović, Gliša, 184
 Eljigidei, Mongol envoy to west, 55
 Eltemir, Cuman prince, 140

- Elvan Çelebi, Sufi, 408
 Eminüddin Mikail, Seljuk *naibūs-saltana* in Konya, 65, 70
 Emir Saltuk, 357, 388
 Enveri, *Düsturname* chronicle, 105, 111
 Ephesus *see* Ayasoluk
 epigraphy
 and evidence of Ilkhanid architecture/building, 268
 and Ottoman architecture, 274
 Epirus
 Ottomans and, 41
 under Michael I Angelos, 26
 Erbil, linen cloth, 243
 Erdmann, Kurt, 331, 335
 Ereğli (Herakleia), 25
 Geyhatu's attack on, 78
 Eretna
 as governor in Anatolia, 94–6
 lieutenant of Demirtaş, 91, 92
 ruler of beylik, 93, 96, 97, 267, 272–3
 Eretnids
 in Ankara, 125
 and Karamanids, 114
 Ermenek (Ermenak)
 Karamanid mosque, 269
 Karamanids at, 114
 Tol Medrese, 298
 Ulu Cami (1302–3), 283
 Erran, 363
 Ertuğrul, earliest Ottoman leader in Anatolia, 118
 Ertuğrul, son of Bayezid I
 as patron, 320
 and settlements in Balkans, 149
 Erzincan, 272, 374
 luxury textiles, 243
 Mengücek Turks in, 357
 Mongol troops at, 62
 Erzurum, 273, 357, 374
 Ahmediye Medrese, 298
 Çifte Minare Medresesi, 76, 300
 as Mongol capital, 90, 99
 occupation (1340), 95, 273
 Yakutiye Medresesi (1310), 268, 268n.2, 298, 316, 340
 Esireddin el-Ebheri, scholar, 413
 Eski Bilecik, mosque of Orhan Bey, 165
 Eskişehir (Dorylaion), 122, 373
 early Ottoman settlement of, 118
 Manuel's rebuilding, 235
 market, 245
 market traders, 245
 nomad encampment (1175), 231
 nomad trade with, 232
 Orhan Gazi Camii, 165, 279, 281
 Eşrefoğlu, 267
 building programmes, 269
 Geyhatu's attack on, 78
 and Mongols, 89
 rebellions against Mongols, 73, 76, 79
 Eşrefoğulları, 114
 military resources, 107
 Ettinghausen, Richard, 328
 Euboea (Negroponte)
 Byzantine capture, 30
 Venetian possession, 43
 Eudocia, empress, 10
 Europe
 alum trade, 242
 crusade against Bayezid (1396), 130
 and crusade against Ottomans (1440s), 136
 exports of cloth to Anatolia, 249–50
 paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331
 towns, 367
 Turkish presence in, 4
 see also France; Italy
 Evhadeddin Kirmani, Sufism of, 391
 evkaf *defters* (*vakıf* registers), 367
 Evliya Çelebi, traveller, 164, 166, 168, 169, 188
 Evrenos, Ottoman commander, 42, 127, 128, 135, 150, 153
 buildings by, 166
 conquest of Gümülcine, 146, 159
 hamam in Yenice-i Vardar, 166
 hans, 161
 mosques, 159, 160–1
 türbe (mausoleum), 166
 Evrenos family, *uc* status, 205
 exports
 banned, 263
 carpets, 328
 grain, 239
 of nomad goods, 233
 of silk and textiles, 243
 slaves, 251
 taxes, 253
 wine and grapes, 239
 Eyice, Semavi, 294, 297
 Fahr al-din al-Razi school, 414
 Fahreddin Ali, of Konya, 297, 407
 as army commander, 76
 building works, 65
 Seljuk *emir-dad* (chief of justice), 57, 61

- as vezir, 65, 68, 70, 74, 75
 Fahreddin Behramşah, 415
 Fahreddin Iraki, Sufi mystic and poet, 391
 Lema'at, 421
 Uşşakname, 416
 Fahreddin Kazvini, *vezir* in Rum, 75, 76–7, 98
 Fahreddin Mesud, Mongol commander, 78
 faience, 317, 339–41
 Fakhr al-Din Qazwini *see* Fahreddin Kazvini
 Fallmerayer, J. P., 153
 Farid al-Din 'Attar, *Mantiq al-Tayr*, 410, 417
 Fars, Ilkhan province of, 52
 Ferecik (Feraï, Pherrai), 146–8
 monastery, 147
 mosque, 147
 Süleyman Paşa Cami, 159
 Ferrara-Florence, Council of (1439), 136
 festivals, shared, 402
 Fethiye, port, export of wine, 239
Fihî ma fihî, 397, 421
 Filibe *see* Philippopolis
 Filov, Bogdan, Prime Minister of Bulgaria, 157
 finance, Ilkhan practices, 4
 Firdowsi, *Shahname*, 417
 first crusade (1095–9), 14–15, 235, 358
 Firuz Ağa, commander of Rumeli Hisarı, 254
 Firuz Bey, Mihaloğlu sultan, 178
 Flisco, Ettore di, Genoese merchant, 260
 Florence
 paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331, 336
 proclamation of Union of the Churches (1439), 48, 136
 Florent de Hainault, prince of Achaia, 33n.136
 folk tradition, in Ottoman chronicles, 117
 fortresses, 31, 32
 garrisons, 210–11
 Rumeli Hisarı, 48, 254
 waterside, 210
 Foss, Clive, 124
 fourth crusade (1202–04), 22, 24, 147, 358
 France
 and Ottomans, 130
 and Sigismund's crusade, 43
 support for Manuel II Palaeologos, 44
 see also Normans
 Frankish empire, collective military service, 216
 Franks
 attack on Turkish merchants, 260
 in Byzantine army, 10
 Frederic II of Sicily, 28
 Frederick I Barbarossa, German king, 18, 19, 21, 363
 Fulk, king of Jerusalem, 17
 Fustat (Old Cairo)
 carpet fragments, 335
 Konya carpet in, 329
fitüvvat (*futuwwa*) movement, in towns, 106, 115
 Gabriel, Albert, 277
 Gagauz people, Seljuk origins of, 141, 142
 Galambóc (Golubac/Gügercinlik), siege of (1428), 225
 Galata, Constantinople, Genoese commercial base, 29
 Galatia, Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
 Gallipoli *see* Gelibolu
 Gangra (Çankırı), siege (1136), 235
 Gascony, mercenaries, 40
 Gattilusio family, Genoese merchants, 242
gazi (fighter), 104, 192
 ideology of, 360
 Gaznevîds, and Seljuks, 356
 Gebze, Orhan Camii, 348
 Gedik Ahmed Paşa, 164
 Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli)
 Catalan mercenary base in, 143
 fortifications, 224
 Ottoman buildings, 274
 Ottoman naval base, 224
 slave market, 250
 wine imports, 239
 Gelibolu, naval battle (1416), 46
 Gelibolu, treaty of (1403), 45, 132
 Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, Ottoman chronicler, 147
 Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli) peninsula
 Byzantine control of, 126, 127
 earthquake (1354), 123
 Greek Christian villages on, 145
 Ottoman occupation (1354), 36, 123, 145
 taken by Amadeo of Savoy, 37, 127
 Gennadios (Scholarios), 406
 Genoa
 alliance with Orhan, 123
 attacks on Constantinople, 35
 and beyliks of Saruhan, 110
 Byzantium and, 19, 31
 and Chioggia War, 38
 conflict with Venice, 35
 naval aid to Byzantium, 28, 29
 and Ottoman navy, 224

- Genoa (*cont.*)
 recapture of Chios, 35
 sources for Turkish economy, 228
 and Tenedos, 38
 trade, 246
 bills of exchange, 248
 grain trade, 240
 metal trade, 241
 with Turks, 261–2, 263
 wine trade, 239
 treaty with (1261), 28
 treaty with Ottomans (1387), 253, 261, 263
 treaty with Venice (1232), 27
 view of Turks as economic partners, 227
- Genoese
 as agents to sultans, 261
 as tax farmers, 257
- George, Saint, 402
- Georgi Terter, tsar in Bulgaria, 140
- Georgia, Mongols in, 53
- Georgians, as mercenaries in Mongol armies, 389
- Georgios Amirutzes, 406
- Georgios Trapezuntios, 406
- Georgius de Hungaria, chronicler, 203
 on janissary training, 207, 222
- Geraki, fortress, 32
- Germiyan, beylik of, 113
 alliance with Aydın, 111
 alum mine, 242
 annexed by Ottomans, 113, 126, 129
 architecture, 270
 relations with Ottomans, 113, 118, 122
 relationship to Seljuks, 113, 267
 and Turkish language, 411
 Turkish nomads in, 231
 Turkoman horses, 232
- Germiyan Turks, 70, 89
 revolt against Mesud, 76
- Germiyanlu, Bulgaria, 153
- Gevas, tomb of Halime Hatun, 307
- Geyhatu, Mongol Ilkhan (1291–95), 81
 Mongol governor in Rum, 75, 76
 as Mongol Han, 77–81
 return to Rum, 78–9, 100
- Ghazan Han, Ilkhan (1295–1304)
 and Byzantine emperor Andronikos II, 88
 conversion to Sunniism (1296), 390
 death, 88
 direct rule in Anatolia, 81–8
 and insurrection of Süleymiş, 84–5, 119
 issue of coinage, 85, 118
- Gibbons, Herbert, 403
- Giresun (Kerasunt)
 market, 252
 wine exports, 239
- Giustiniano, Francesco, 261
- Giustiniano, Giovanni, 261
- Giustiniano, Ottobono, 260
- Giyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, Seljuk sultan
 and Byzantine rebels, 24
 conquest of Antalya (1207), 254
 and non-Muslims, 388
 poet, 416
 resettlement of Byzantine captives in
 Philomilon, 238
 and Venice, 26
- Giyaseddin Keyhüsrev II, Seljuk sultan
 (1237–43), 53
 death, 54
 as governor under Mongols, 54
 and Seljuk state, 359
- Giyaseddin Keyhüsrev III, Seljuk sultan
 (1265–83), 63, 64, 68, 73
 confirmed in sultanate of Rum (1282), 73
 execution (1283), 267
- Giyaseddin Mesud II, Seljuk sultan in Konya,
 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 111
 and Beyşehir, 269
 and rebellion of Baltu, 83
- gold
 coins, 247
 trade, 241
- Golden Horde, 63
 and control over Anatolia, 54
 migration into Mamluk territory (1262), 61
 relations with Byzantium, 30
 relations with Ilkhanate, 52
- Gordlevsky, V., 354
- Gorgorum (Ararim), Eşrefoğlu from, 89
- Göynük, taken by Ottomans, 122
- grain
 production, 372
 taxes on, 252
 trade and production, 239
- Greater Armenia *see* Armenia; Lesser Armenia
- Greece
 and challenge to Byzantine emperor, 24
 fragmentation of, 144
 invasion by Bayezid I, 43, 130
 partial Byzantine reconquest, 30
 relations with Nicaea, 27
 sources, 228
 Turkish colonisation, 156
 Turkish invasion, 43

- Uzes penetration of, 9
 Greeks
 in Anatolia, 361
 in towns, 376
 Gregoras, Greek chronicler, 228
 Gregory VII, Pope, 12
 Gregory X, Pope, 30
 Guiscard, Robert, Norman commander, 11
 blockade of Dyrrachium, 12
 Gülçiçek Hatun, wife of Murad I, 320
 Gülşehri, Sufi poet, 417
 Gümülcine, 146
 Eski Cami, 159, 161, 164
 Gazi Evrenos İmareti, 159, 160–1, 188
 hamam, 159
 Ottoman population registers, 146, 149
 Gümüş
 Hacı Halil Paşa (Haliliye Medresesi), 302
 silver mines, 91
 Gümüş Madeni, 302
 Gümüştekin Ahmed Gazi (d. 1104), ruler of
 Danişmend, 247, 388
 gunpowder technology, 137, 218
 artillery, 218–19
 firearms, 219
 Gürçi Melek, as patron, 319
 Güyük, son of Ögedei, Great Qa'an (from
 1246), 54, 56
 election as Great Qa'an, 55

 Hacı Alaeddin of Konya, architect, 171
 Hacı Ali b. Ahmed al-Tabrizi, craftsman, 342,
 350
 Hacı b. Musa, architect, 281
 Hacı Bayram Veli, tomb in Ankara, 348
 Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, Turkoman *şeyh*, 394, 397–8,
 402, 404
 Hacı İlbeği, Turkoman marcher lord, 127
 Hacı İvaz b. Ahi Bayezid, architect, 169, 295,
 320, 350
 Hacı Muhammed b. Abdülaziz al-Daki,
 craftsman, 347
 Hacı Şihabeddin, as patron, 320
 Hacı Turhan, caravansary, 148
 Hacsar, alum mine, 242
 Hadidi, poet-historian, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*,
 147
 Hadrian IV, Pope, 18
 Hafsa Hatun, wife of Bayezid I, 319
 Hafsa Sultan, as patron, 320
 Hafuzeddin Mehmed Efendi (d. 1424), jurist,
 320
 Hakim Senayi, 417

 Halil, son of Orhan, 123
 Halil Bahadır, Turkoman chief, sack of
 Konya, 78
 Halil Paşa, emir of Gümüş Madeni, 302
 as patron, 320
 Halvetiye *tarikât*, 393
 Hamadan, 58
hamams (public baths), 245
 Bursa, 276
 Dimetoka, 169
 Edirne, 175, 182–3
 Gümülcine, 159
 İhtiman, 167
 Philippopolis, 185
 Thessalonike, 158, 188
 Tirnov, 178
 vakıfs for, 377
 Yenice-i Vardar, 166
 Hamd Allah Mustaufi Qazvini, chronicler, 93,
 228
 on Erzincan, 273
 on textiles, 326
 on tribute to Mongols, 229
 Hamid, beylik of, 109, 113–14, 267
 annexed by Ottomans, 126
 Hamid family, and beylik of Teke, 112
 Hamidoğlu Dündar Bey, 91
 Hamidoğlu Feleküddin Dündar, Turkoman
 leader of Uluborlu, 89
 Hamidoğlu İshak Bey, 93
 Hamza Bey, mosque at Zağra Eskihsar, 170–1
Hamzaname epic, 410
 Hancın, castle of, 251
 Hanefi *mezheb*, 385, 413n.137
hans, 314–16
 see also caravansary
 Hanzade Hatun, as patron, 319
 Harezmşah Celeleddin Mingbarni, Seljuk
 leader, 53
 Harput, Artukid Turks in, 357
 Hasan b. 'Abd el-Mümin, *Gunyât al-Katib wa*
 Munyât al-Talib, 421
 Hasan Bey, Skopje, 184
 Hasan Bey, son of Tuqu, 80, 81
 Hasluck, F. W., 401, 403
 Hatib el-Kazvini, scholar, 413
 Hatir, sons of, 68
 Hayderiye, *tarikât*, 384, 392
 Hayrabolu (near Tekirdağ), Güzelce Hasan
 Bey Camii, 292
 Helena, daughter of John Kantakouzenos, 34
 Henry of Flanders, 24, 25, 26
 Herakleia (Ereğli), 25, 78

- Heraklios, emperor (610–41), 355
 Herat, 266
 Heywood, Colin, 118
 Hibri Efendi, historian of Edirne, 162, 169, 176, 179
hisar eri (fortress guard), 210
 Husn-i Keyf (Hasankeyf), tomb of Zeynel Mirza, 308
Historia Peregrinorum (1190), 140
 historiography, 4–5
 history, writings on, 421
 see also chronicles
 Hızır Bey, 96
 in Kırkkilise, 164
 Hoca Ahmad b. Nufiman, architect, 298
 Hoca Dehmani, poet, 409, 417
 Hoca Sinan, merchant, as patron, 320
 Hodgson, Marshall G., 383
 Homs, battle of (1281), 72
 Horasani, Sufi group, 390
 horse drovers (*at çekeni*), 115
 horses
 breeding pedigrees, 232
 draught, 220
 for Turkish cavalry, 217
 Turkoman trade in, 231–2
 hospices
 for dervishes in Mekece, 120
 Sivas, 272
 see also *zaviyes*
 Hospitallers of Rhodes, 39, 47
 and Achaia, 40
 purchase of grain, 240
 support for Theodore I Palaeologos, 44
 trade in Turkoman horses, 232
 trade restrictions, 264
 Huguet, Jaume, *Madonna and Child with Saints*, 333
 Hülegü, first Ilkhan (1253–65), 56, 63
 and Baiju, 58
 formation of Ilkhanate under, 57–64, 75
 and Seljuk sultans, 59
 Syrian campaign, 59, 61, 63
 Hungarians (Magyars), 8
 Danube river fleet, 225
 and Ottoman artillery, 218
 Turkic origins of, 138
 Hungary
 Bayezid's campaign (1395), 130
 Byzantine relations with, 15, 16, 18
 and crusade against Ottomans (1440s), 137
 occupation of Dalmatia, 21
 Ottomans and, 30, 48, 136
 Hunyadi, Janoš, Crusade of Varna (1444), 190
 Hurufi, shi'i–Ismaili teaching, 387
 Hüsameddin Bicar, *subaşı* of Harput, 66
 Husamzada Sunullah, painter, 321
 Iacopo de Promontorio, Genoese merchant, 227
 Ibn Battuta, Arab chronicler, 92, 120, 228
 on *ahilik*, 245, 375
 on buildings in Peçin, 270
 in Dobrudja, 141
 on economy of Anatolia, 264
 on Eretna towns, 272
 on Erzurum, 273
 freedom of travel, 109
 on İznik, 122
 on low prices, 229
 on Ottoman expansion, 122
 on textiles, 326
 traveller's account (*Rihle*), 106, 367
 on Turkish rugs, 243, 328
 on Turkoman palaces, 311
 on *ulema* in towns, 376
 Ibn Bibi, historian/chronicler, 59, 63, 68, 70, 72
 al'Awamir al-'Ala'iyya, 421
 on languages, 407
 on patronage of poets, 415
 Selçukname, 141
 as source, 228
 translation of chronicle of, 410
 İbn Sa'id (d. 1274), 328
 İbni Melek, jurist, 313, 319
 İbrahim Paşa, 45
İbtidaname poem, 416
 İhtiman, Bulgaria, 166–7
 hamam, 167
 han, 167
 imaret/zaviye, 167
ilahi aşk (divine love), 396
ilchi (envoys), Mongol, tribute to, 54
 İldar, son of Ejei, 82
 İldei, son of Kongurtay, 82
 İlge Noyan, Celayirid family of, 78
 İlica (Trajanopolis), Ottoman *han*, 161
 İlisu, Mahmud Bey Camii, 348
 Ilkhanid state, in Anatolia, 4, 97, 267
 army, 222n.128
 in Azerbaijan, 52
 dissension within (1282–94), 73–81
 dissolution of, 51, 97
 formation, under Hülegü, 57–64
 influence on Ottoman administration, 256

- relations with Seljuks of Rum, 62–3, 66–7,
72–3, 374
and Shi'ism, 386
towns, 268, 374
see also Mongols
- Ilkhans, marriage connections with Seljuks,
74
- imarets* (soup kitchens, religious and social
complexes), 377
Bursa, 131, 294
Çekirge, 294, 302
Edirne, 168, 174–5, 188, 190
Gümülcine, 159, 160–1, 188
İhtiman, 167
İznik, 160, 294, 317
as mosque complexes = *zaviyes*, 297
Skopje, 159
- imports
metals, 241
raw silk, 326
taxes, 253
weapons, 219n.119, 241
wine, 239
- İnalcık, Halil, 156, 246, 264
- İncir Limanı (Paralime, Liminia), port, 239
- industries
metalwork, 321
in towns, 243
- İnönü (near Eskişehir), mosque of Koca
Yadigar, 165
- inscriptions, 269, 269n.3
citadel in Philippopolis, 176
Gazi Evrenos mosque (Gümülcine),
160
Hamza Bey, at Stara Zagora, 171
Orkhon-Jenissej runes, 139
Skopje, 178
Thessalonike, 189
Tirnovο, 178
Tsar Ivan Vladislav in Bitola, 177
- intellectual life, 406–21
see also scholars; scholarship
- İntihaname*, poem, 416
- Iqbal (Aqbal), son of Baiju, 62
- Iran *see* Persia
- Irencin, Mongol commander, 88, 90
- iron
mines, 240
trade in, 241
- İsa, son of Bayezid, 45, 132
- İsa b. Muhammad, emir of Aydın, 286
at Birgi, 270
as patron, 319
- Isakios I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor
(d. 1061), 9
- Isakios II Angelos, Byzantine emperor
(1185–95), 21
revolt of Mangaphas, 234, 236
- İsfendiyağulları, beylik of, 96, 115–16, 267
architecture, 271–2
and copper mines, 254
- İshak Bey, ruler of Saruhan, Ulu Cami in
Manisa, 290
- İshak Bey, son of Yiğit, buildings in Skopje,
184–5, 190
- Ishaković family, 184
- İshkali, *han* (caravansary) at, 65
- İskendername* chronicle, 132, 322, 418
- Islam
in Anatolia, 363, 380
apostasy from, 403
conversion of churches to mosques, 159,
167
conversions to, 403
Kurds, 361
mass, 404
Mongols, 64, 99, 365, 405
Oğuz, 361
form of government, 98
mezheps, 384, 385
Mongol attitude to, in Anatolia, 66, 81
popular, and Sufism, 391, 399
and role of *medreses*, 411
and scholarship, 383
Shari'a established under Eretna, 96
spread in Balkans, 142–3, 145–6
theological debates with Christianity,
405–18
and Turkification, 360
urban culture, 97, 375–7
Yazidism, 387
see also mosques; Shi'ism; Sufism;
Sunniism
- istimalet* (persuasion), 388
- Istanbul *see* Constantinople
- Italy
Anatolian rugs in, 331, 335
exports of arms and armour, 219n.119
paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331, 335
see also Florence; Genoa; Venice
- Ivan Asen II, Bulgarian emperor (1218–41), 27
- Ivanko, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
- İzmir, battle of (1348), 111
- İzmir (Smyrna), 111
partial occupation by crusader force (1344),
34

- İzmit (Nikomedea), 26, 119
 besieged (1333), 222n.129
 taken by Ottomans (1337), 121–2, 236
- İznik (Nicaea), 119, 134
 Kırgızlar Türbesi, 309, 324
 mosques
 Hacı Özbek, 124, 281
 Ottoman (1333), 120
 Yeşil Cami, 164, 281, 317, 340
 Nilüfer Hatun İmareti, 160, 294, 317
 Ottoman *medreses*, 124
 Süleyman Paşa Medresesi, 302
 pottery
 finds, 336
 frit wares, 338, 344
 kilns, 338
 recaptured by Byzantium, 14
 and Seljuks, 27
 taken by crusaders (1096), 358
 taken by Ottomans (1331), 122, 198, 236, 274
 taken by Süleyman from Byzantium (1081), 357
 Theodore Laskaris as emperor, 24–5, 26
 Turkomans in, 13, 88
 Yakub Çelebi Zaviyesi, 294
- İzzeddin Keykavus I, Seljuk ruler (1210–20), 25, 26
 and poets, 415, 416
 as Seljuk sultan, 358
 tolerance of Christians, 389
 and trade, 373
- İzzeddin Keykavus II (1246–8), Seljuk ruler, 405
 in Balkans, 141
 and Byzantium, 63
 descendants in eastern Anatolia, 75
 in exile, 59, 63, 68, 72
 gifts of land, 237
 at Konya, 59
 relations with Mongols, 57–9
 rivalry with Rükneddin, 55, 56, 58
 Seljuk sultan, 54
- Jacques de Baux, prince of Achaia, 40
 Jalal al-Din Rumi *see* Celaleddin Muhammed Rumi
- Jalayrids, Mongol rulers in Iraq and Azerbaijan, 268
- janissary corps, 206–8
 development of, 129, 137
devşirme system, 124, 126, 137, 206
 origins of, 124
pencik system, 206
 role in sieges, 223
 role of, 207
 training, 207
- javelin (*gönder*), 201
- al-Jawbari, Arab mystic, 386
- Jerusalem, capture by Saladin, 21
- Jews, in towns, 376
- Jireček, Constantin, 140
- Joanna I of Naples, princess of Achaia, 40
- Jocelin I of Courtenay, regent of Antioch, 16
- Jochids, Mongol rulers in southern Russia and the Caucasus, 57, 61
- John II Komnenos (1118–43), 15–17
 attack on Konya, 236
 campaigns in East, 16–17
 marriage to Hungarian princess, 15
- John III Doukas Vatatzes, emperor in Nicaea (1222–54), 10, 11, 26–8
 and Seljuk encroachments, 27
- John IV Laskaris (1258–9), 28
- John V Palaeologos, Byzantine emperor (1341–91), 33–9
 appeals to Rome, 37
 conversion to Catholicism, 37
 and Hungary, 37
 and Venice, 36
 war with John Kantakouzenos, 123, 144
- John VI Kantakouzenos, Byzantine Grand Domestic and rival emperor, 33–6, 144
 battle of Pelekanon of, 121, 123
 and beylik of Aydın, 111
 destructive raids, 237
 on fortification of Ferecik, 147
 recognised as John VI (1347–54), 34
- John VII, son of Andronikos IV, 39
 and Bayezid I, 42
 and Manuel II Palaeologos, 44
- John VIII Palaeologos, co-emperor with Manuel II, 46, 47
 appeal to west, 47–8
- Junayd Baghdadi (d.910), Sufi, 394
- Justinian I, Roman emperor (527–65), 6, 355
- Kadı Burhaneddin, post-Mongol ruler of eastern Anatolia, scholar and poet, 129, 130, 419
Anis al-Kulub, 416
 buildings, 272
Divan, 419
vezir (from 1378), 96
- Kadı İzzeddin Razi, Seljuk *vezir*, 57, 65
- Kadı Musliheddin, architect, 173
- kadı sicilleri* (Shari'a court records), 403

- Kadiriye, Sufi *tarikāt*, 390
 Kalehisar, pottery type, 336
kalem işi (brushwork painting), 322–4, 345
 Kalenderiye, *tarikāt*, 384, 392
 Kalojan, Bulgarian tsar, 24
 Kantakouzenos, chronicle of, 121, 228
 Kapıdağ (Cyprus), alum production, 242
 Kara Osman, Akkoyunlu chief, 97
 Kara Rüstem Paşa, tax farmer, 257
 Kara Tatars (Mongols), 365
 Kara Timurtaş Paşa, as patron, 320
 Karaca, Dulgadir chief, 96
 Karaca Hisar, 244
 market, 245, 252
 Karahanids, *kagan's* military retinue, 192
 Karahisar, 91
 alum production, 242
 Küçük's revolt at, 94
 Karahöyük, Mongol troops at, 62
 Karakoyunlu, Turkoman confederation, 268
 occupation of Erzurum (1385), 273
 Karaman (Larende), 269
 Arapzade mosque, 283
 Dikbasan mosque, 283
 Emir Musa Medresesi, 300
 Emir Musa Paşa Medresesi (1350), 269
 Hacıbeyler mosque, 283
 Halil Efendi Sultan complex (1409–10), 269
 Hatuniye Medresesi (1381–2), 269, 298, 316
 İbrahim Bey İmareti (1432), 269
 Mader-i Mevlana Zaviyesi (1370), 269
 mausoleum of Alaeddin Bey, 307
 tomb of Eminüddin, 306
 tomb of İbrahim Bey, 308
 tomb of Karamanoğlu Alaeddin Bey (1388), 269
 urban *ahî* brotherhoods in, 115
 Karaman, beylik of, 114–15
 access to Mediterranean, and trade, 115
 congregational mosques, 283
 economy, 115
 iron mines, 240
 Ottomans and, 43, 48, 114, 125, 135
 part annexed by Ottomans, 126
 Seljuk legacy of, 115
 under Ottomans (1397), 130
 under Ottomans (1417), 133
 under Timur, 114, 132
 Karamanids, 267
 capture of Beyşehir (1329), 93
 capture of Konya, 89
 Eretna and, 97
 Geyhatu's assaults on, 79
 Mongol raids against, 88, 100
 raids against Mongols, 114
 rebellions against Mongols, 70–1, 73, 76, 79, 90
 Seljuk domination of, 64
 uprising (1262), 62
 Karamanoğlu, building programmes, 269
 Karamanoğlu İbrahim Bey, *medrese* (1432), 300
 Karamanoğlu Musa Paşa, 91, 93
 medrese in Konya, 300
 Karamanoğulları, 95, 96
 Şikari's chronicle of, 105
 Karamıkbeli *see* Myriokephalon
 Karanbük, battle of (1343), 95
 Karası, beylik of, 109, 110, 141, 267, 271
 annexed by Ottomans, 122
 settlements in Macedonia, 154
 slave market, 250, 251
 Karatay, advisor to İzzeddin, 56
 Karim al-Din Aqsara'i, Seljuk historian, 325, 407
 Musamarat al-Akhbar, 421
 Karpathos, 33
 Kasaba Köyü (near Kastamonu)
 mosque of Mahmud Bey, 348
 Ulu Cami, 288
 Kashani, chronicler, 93
 Kastamonu
 centre of beylik of İsfendiyoğulları, 116, 271
 copper mines, 240
 emirs of, 80
 Halil Bey Camii (1363–64), 271
 İbni Neccar Camii (1353), 271, 281, 348
 lands at, 60
 Mahmud Bey Camii (1366–67), 271
 market, 229, 252
 woollen goods, 243
 Turkoman horses, 232
katepanos, Byzantine regional governors, 12
 Katip Çelebi, 169
 Kavala (Gevele), 79
 Ottoman control, 151
 Kayseri (Caesarea in Cappadocia), 373
 Hatuniye Medrese, 298
 Köşk Medresesi (1339), 272
 medrese in, 65
 as Mongol capital, 99, 267
 Mongol garrison, 93
 population, 376
 sack of, 96
 Seljuk centre, 65
 Sırçalı Kümbet tomb, 308

- Kayseri (Caesarea in Cappadocia) (*cont.*)
 slave market, 251
 tomb of Ali Cafer, 306
- Kazanlâk, *türbe* (mausoleum) of Lala Şahin Paşa, 162
- Kemah Köyü, of Kastamonu, 271
- Kemaleddin Ebubekr, *Ravdat al-Manazir*, 420
- Kemaleddin Hubeyş b. İbrahim Tiflisi, poet, 417
- Kemaleddin Kamyar, emir, poet, 416
- Kemaleddin Tiflisi, as *naibüs-saltana*, 86
- Kemalpaşazade, chronicler, 151
- Kephalaria
 Norman occupation, 21
 Venetian attacks on, 16
- Keramat-i Ahi Evren*, treatise, 417
- Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, 269
- Khorasm, 363
 towns, 376
- Khurasan, Ilkhan province of, 52
- Khurasanis, 80
- Kilavuz, sons of, 77
- Kılıç* (sword), 194
- Kılıç Arslan I, Seljuk sultan (1092–1107), 14, 358
 taxation, 252
- Kılıç Arslan II, Seljuk sultan (1156–92), 20n.73, 21, 358
 and Aksaray, 258
 siege of Laodikeia, 235
 silver coinage, 247
- Kılıç Arslan IV, Seljuk sultan (1248–61), 60, 268
 claim to Seljuk sultanate, 55, 56
 coinage issues, 58–60
 descendants in western Anatolia, 75
 execution (1265/6), 63
 gifts of land, 237
 marriage to daughter of Mongol envoy, 55
 as ruler in Konya, 58
 as sultan of Rum, 55
- Kinnamos, Greek chronicler, 228
 on nomad encampments, 231
- Kıpçak *see* Cumans
- Kırkkilise, Eski Cami, 163
- Kirman, Seljuks of, 86
- Kırşehir (Mocissus), 91, 373
 Mongol troops at, 62
 tomb of Aşık Paşa, 308, 310, 316
- Kızılbaş movement, 387, 398
- Komnenoi dynasty, 11–21
- Kongurtay, Mongol prince, 70, 73, 100
 challenge to Ahmad, 74
- Konstantin of Ostrović, Serbian janissary, 162
- Konus, castle of, 150
- Konya (Iconium)
 architecture
hanekah of Sahib Ata Fahreddin Ali, 297
 Hasbey Darülhuffazı, 316, 340
 international market, 248
medreses; İnce Minareli Medrese, 300;
 Karatay Medrese, 300
 mosques; Hacı Ferruh, 279; Larende
 Camii, 297; Seljuk *medsids*, 165
 palace, 311
 tombs; Celaleddin Rumi, 308; Fakih
 Dede tomb, 308; of Kalender Baba,
 306
 besieged by Bayezid, 130
 captured by Karamanids, 70, 89, 114
 carpets, 329–31
 corruption of local officials, 76
 cultural centre, 65
 falls to Ottomans (1397), 130
 and first crusade, 235
 as Mongol capital, 58, 59, 100, 267
 Mongol threat to, 58, 79
 population, 376
 restoration of Mongol control (1315), 89
 Seljuk capital, 358, 373
 taken by Demirtaş (1323), 91
 Turkoman sack of (1291), 78
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad, 228, 380, 383, 390
 on poets, 409
 on Sufism, 390, 398
- Köprülü (Veles), Macedonia, tax register, 154
- Korkudeli, buildings, 269
- Kösedağ, battle of (1243), 27, 51, 53, 100, 267
- Kosovo/Kossovo
 destruction of Ottoman monuments, 157
 Ottoman advance to, 127
- Kosovo, second battle of (1448), 137, 190, 218, 221
- Kosovo Polje (Kosyphopedion), battle of (1389), 42, 128, 163, 207
- Kritoboulos, Byzantine chronicler, 240
- Kubadiye, Turkish town, 374
- Kübreviye, *tarik*, 392
- Küçük *see* Şeyh Hasan (Küçük)
- Kudelin, Cuman nobleman, 140
- Kühnel, Ernst, 331
- Kuhurgai, Mongol commander, 71
- külliye* (religious and social complex), 184, 185, 274, 377
- Kur Temür, *yarghuchi*, 83
- Kuran, Aptullah, 278

- Kurds
 in Anatolia, 361
 enforced migration (*sürgün*), 368
- Kürei Hadit Köyü, İsmail Bey complex
 (1451–54), 271
- Kütahya, 113, 204, 267
 alum production, 242
 buildings, 270
 Balıklı Cami, 270
 Çatal Mescid, 270
 Kale-i Bala Camii, 270
 Kurşunlu Camii, 270, 281
 Pekmez Pazarı Mescidi, 279
 Vacidiye Medresesi, 270, 300–2
 pottery kilns, 338
- Kutalmış, Turkoman leader, 357
- Kutbeddin Haydar, use of Turkish language,
 409
- Kutbeddin Şirazi, *kadı* of Sivas, 73, 413
- Kutluşah, senior emir in Anatolia, 82, 84
- Kutrigurs, 138
- Kydones, Demetrios, on Thrace, 145
- Lala Şahin Paşa, Ottoman governor in
 Balkans, 128, 276
 bridge in Philippopolis, 185
 capture of Stara Zagora, 170
 mausoleum in Kazanlâk, 162
 tomb in Mustafakemalpaşa (Kirmastı), 309
- lance (*süngü*), 194
- land
 gifts of, 237
 surveys, 237
 taxation of, 237–8
- land tenure
 Mongol legacy, 98
 Seljuk *miri* system, 372
 state ownership of, 237
 Turkish system, 237–9
- language, 407–11
 Arabic, 407
 for accounts, 61
 Ottoman texts in, 120
 in Seljuk state, 407
 Mongol influence, 116
 Orkhon-Jenissej runes, 139
 Persian, 407, 410
 Ottoman texts in, 120
 for poetry, 416
 for scientific literature, 420
 in Seljuk court, 61, 114, 407
 Turkish, 70, 101, 114, 142, 401, 407, 422
 in Balkans
 in beyliks, 116, 407
 for diplomacy, 409
 as official language, 70, 409
 poetry, 408, 416–19
 translations into, 111, 112, 409, 410–11
 written, 111, 408
- Laodikeia *see* Denizli
- lapis lazuli, 240
- Larende *see* Karaman
- Larende, battle of (1291), 78
- Laskarid dynasty, 28, 266
- Latin states, 17, 18
 aspirations for recapture of
 Constantinople, 30
 Byzantine resentment of, 20
 at Constantinople, 22–8
 control of Constantinople, 22–8, 359
 and grain trade, 239
 and Nicaea, 26
 Ottoman threat to, 128
 and second crusade, 17
 Sicilian kingdom and, 29
 territories attacked by Bayezid I, 43
 trade with Turks, 228–9
- Latins
 as tax farmers, 257–8
 trade with Turks, 261–4
- law
 on non-Muslims (*ahl al-dhimma*), 388, 389,
 403
 secular state, 98
 Shari'a, 96, 98
 on *wakıf*s, 378
- Lazar, Prince of Serbia, 128
- lead, exported, 241
- Leon, king of Lesser Armenia, 251
- Lesbos *see* Mitylene
- Lesser Armenia (Cilicia), 17
 independence during Mongol period, 52
- Leunclavius, *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum*,
 152
- Levounion, battle of (1091), 14
- Lewis, Bernard, 383
- Licario, Italian commander, 30
- literature, 104, 410–11, 415–19
 Germiyan beylik, 113
 poetry, 415–19
 prose, 420–1
 religious texts, 104
 Turkish translations from Persian, 111, 112,
 409
see also chronicles
- Livadia, Navarrese in, 40

- Louis, Saint, king of France, 30
 Louis I, king of Hungary, 37
 Louis VII, king of France, second crusade, 17
 Louis of Blois, claimant to Nicaea (İznik), 24
 Lycaonian plain
 Karamanid beylik in, 114
 wealth of, 115
 Lycia, beylik of Teke in, 112
 Lydia, Saruhan beylik in, 110
 Lyons, Council of (1274), 30
- Macedonia
 Ottoman settlement of, 154–5
 Ottoman suzerainty over, 128
 Pecheneg raids, 16
 Turkish Christian minority at Zichné, 141
 Turkish raids on, 144
 Macedonia, Republic of, destruction of
 Ottoman monuments, 157
- Magyars *see* Hungarians
 Mahmud, son of Esen Kutluğ, 92
 Mahmud b. Ebubekr el-Urmevi, *Lata'if al-Hikma* and *Metali' al-Anwar*, 421
 Mahmud b. el-Hatab, *Fustat al-Adala fi Qawa'id al-Saltana*, 421
 Mahmud Bey, son of Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, 269
 Mahmud Çelebi, as patron, 320
 Makri, Byzantine town, 146
 Malatya (Melitene)
 conquest by Kılıç Arslan I (1106), 358
 Danişmends of, 16, 357
 Mamluk sack of (1315), 89
 Turkoman attacks on, 235
 Malazgirt (Manzikert), battle of (1071), 1, 6, 10, 51, 356
 al-Malik al-Ashraf, Ayyubid prince, 394
 Malkoç family, *uc* status, 205
 Mamistra (Misis), recaptured by Byzantium, 17
 Mamluks
 artistic influence, 266, 351
 and beylik of Karaman, 114
 defeat of Mongols (1277), 69
 and Demirtaş, 91, 92
 in Egypt, 30
 expedition against Qal'at al-Rum, 79
 invasion of Seljuk Anatolia, 66
 relations with Mongols, 73
 sack of Malatya (1315), 89
 Seljuks and, 66
 siege of Sis citadel (1320), 235
 in Syria, 52, 61, 63
 as threat to Mongols, 67, 93, 95, 96
 trade with, 228
 victory at Homs (1281), 72
 Manakib al-Arifin, 393, 397, 404, 421
 Manastır (Monastir, Bitola)
 mosque, 177–8
 Ottoman advance to, 127
 Ottoman settlers in, 154
 Mane, fortress, 32
 Manfred of Hohenstaufen (1258–66), 29, 30
 Manfred of Sicily, 28
 Mangaphas, revolt of, 234, 236
 Manicheism, 364, 381
 Manisa, capital of Saruhan beylik, 110
 İlyas Bey Mescidi (1363), 271
 Mevlevihane zaviye (1368–69), 271
 tomb of Saruhanoğlu İshak Bey, 271
 Ulu Cami, 181, 271, 290, 318, 340, 347
 Mansur-e Hallaj (d. 922), Sufi, 394
 Manuel I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor (1143–80), 17–20, 236
 and Asia Minor, 19
 and Turkoman nomads, 231, 235, 236
 Manuel II, co-emperor (1373–6), 38, 41
 alliance with Ottomans, 133
 appeals to west, 43–4
 consolidation of lands in the Morea, 45
 as emperor, 39–47
 letters and *Dialogues*, 39, 50
 and Ottoman rebellions against Murad II, 135
 as Ottoman vassal, 43, 45, 217
 visit to Europe (1399–1403), 44
 Manuel Angelos, domains in Greece, 27
 Manuel Kantakouzenos, ruler of Byzantine Peloponnese, 36, 40
 Manuel Mavrozomes, Byzantine rebel, 24
 manuscripts, illustrated, 321–2
 Maona family of Chios, merchants, 242
 Maqasid al-Alhan, treatise on music, 321
 Mar Sarkis, Armenian bishop, murder of, 66
 marble, for façades, 316
 Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini, chronicler, 239
 marcher districts, Ottoman military organisation, 204–5
 marcher lords
 in Bithynia, 194
 under Ottomans, 127, 128, 135
 Marcionism, 381
 Marco Polo, 228
 on carpets, 233, 328

- on silks, 243, 325
- on Turkoman horses, 232
- Mardin, 374
 - Akkoyunlu centre, 273
 - Artukid Turks in, 357
 - Latifiye Camii, 284, 290
- Marie d'Enghien, 42
- Marino Sanudo Torsello, Venetian historian,
 - Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crusis*
- Maritsa, battle of *see* Çirmen
- markets
 - international, 248–50
 - nomad use of, 369
 - slave, 250–2
 - urban, 243
 - organisation of, 245
 - see also* *bedestan* (covered market)
- Marko, 'king' of Macedonia, 154
- Maroneia, Byzantine town, 146
- Martin, F. R., 329
- Mary of Antioch, 20
- Masnavi-i Ma'navi* / *Masnevi-i Ma'navi*, 397, 416
- Matteo Villani, Florentine historian, 145
- Matthew Kantakouzenos, governor of
 - Adrianople, 36
 - as ruler of Byzantine Peloponnese, 37, 40, 145
- Mattias Corvinus, King, 163
- Mayyakfarikin (Silvan), Ulu Cami, 283
- Mazdaism, 381
- Mecdeddin Ebubekr, poet and scribe, 416
- Mecdi, translator, 180
- Mecdeddin (Majd al-Din), *atabey*, 84
- medicine, books on, 420
- medreses* (schools), 298–305, 411
 - Bursa, 276, 302
 - closed court type, 298–302
 - Didymoteichon (Dimetoka), 140
 - Erzurum, 76, 268, 268n.2, 298, 316, 340
 - İznik, 124, 302
 - Karaman, 269, 298, 300, 316
 - open court type, 298, 302
 - organisation of, 4
 - Ottoman, 124, 129
 - Philippopolis, 185
 - Seljuk, 65, 298
 - teaching, 412–13
- Megara, Navarrese in, 40
- Mehmed I (1352–66), ruler of Eretna, 96
- Mehmed I (1413–21), Ottoman ruler, 45, 46, 132–3, 174
 - campaign in Anatolia, 133
 - mosques, 169, 172
 - resettlement of Tatars, 149
 - as sole ruler, 133
- Mehmed II, nominal sultan of Eretna's
 - principality (1380s), 97
- Mehmed II (1451–81), Ottoman ruler, 48, 102, 136, 168
 - art and architecture, 267
 - and copper production, 240
 - defeat of Byzantium (1453), I, 48
 - and Genoa, 227
 - and Ottoman artistic style, 351
 - and Ottoman empire, 360
 - repopulation of Constantinople, 244, 258
 - resettlement of abandoned lands, 239
 - theological debates, 406
 - and trade, 254
- Mehmed V Reşad (1909–18), Ottoman ruler, 163
- Mehmed Bey, brother of Ali Padişah, 92
- Mehmed Bey, emir of Aydın, at Birgi, 270, 319, 347
- Mehmed Bey (d. 1363), of Germiyan, 411
- Mehmed Bey, son of Eretna, 273
- Mehmed Bey, son of the Pervane, 87
- Mehmed Bey Karamanoğlu, Turkoman chief
 - of Denizli (Ladik), 64, 70
 - and use of Turkish language, 70, 409
- Mekece, hospice for dervishes, 120
- Melami movement, 396
- Melik Pahlavan Ghuri, as tax administrator, 83
- Melik Salih Mahmud, Artukid ruler, 284
- Melikşah, son of Baltu, 90
- menakibnames* (accounts of heroic deeds), 404, 410
- Mengücek bey, Turkoman leader, 357
- Mengücek state, and Islam, 383
- Mengücekids
 - towns, 374
 - Turkish language, 407
- Menteşe, beylik of, 27, 109, 111–12, 267
 - annexed by Bayezid, 43, 223
 - counterfeit Venetian coinage in, 247
 - Geyhatu's attack on, 79
 - independence, 45
 - market taxes, 253
 - slave market, 250
 - tax farming, 257
 - trade with Latin states, 261, 262
 - Venetian merchants in, 262
 - weights and measures, 246
 - wine imports, 239

- Menteşeli, Bulgaria, 153
 mercenaries
 Byzantine reliance on, 9, 11, 31, 126
 Byzantine use of Turks, 142, 144
 Ottoman use of Balkan Christians, 126
 merchants
 complaints in Antalya, 254
 European, 376
 foreign, 261–4
 and markets, 252
 as patrons, 320
 protection for, 245, 259–61
 source material for economy, 228–9
 Turkish, 259–61
 see also Genoa; trade; Venice
 Mesembria
 lost to Bulgars, 33
 retaken by Byzantium, 37
 Mesud, son of sultan İzzeddin, 72, 73
 Mesud, sultan in Konya, 78
 Mesud I Rükneddin (1116–56), Seljuk sultan,
 20n.73, 358, 414
 coins, 247
 Konya, 358, 414
 and revolt of Melik, 80
 Mesud II Gıyaseddin, Seljuk sultan in Konya,
 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 111
 and Beyşehir, 269
 and rebellion of Baltu, 83
 Mesud b. Ahmed (Hoca Mesud), *Süheyl ü*
 Nev-Bahar, 418
 metalwork, 321
 trade, 241–2
 Mevleviye (Celaliye), *tarikât*, 390, 393
 Michael, Suriyani historian, 388
 Michael, tax collector in Mylassa, 234
 Michael I Angelos (1204–15), 23, 26
 Michael VII Doukas, 10
 Michael VIII Palaeologos (1259–82), 28
 capture of Constantinople (1261), 28
 opposition to, 31
 restoration of Byzantine Empire, 29–31
 and Seljuk sultan İzzeddin, 63, 141
 Michael Autoreianos, patriarch of
 Constantinople, 24
 Michael of Epiros, 28
 Michael Šišman, Bulgarian tsar, invasion of
 Thrace, 147
 Michael Szilágyi, Hungarian chronicler, 222
 Mihajlović, Konstantin, janissary, 206, 209
 on siege of Constantinople (1453), 222
 Mihalçoğlu family, Bulgaria, 166, 178
 uc status, 205
 Mihalçoğlu Mahmud Bey (d. 1402), 167
 Mihalçoğlu Mehmet Bey (1422), 174
 Milas, 111, 270
 Firuz Bey Camii, 294, 317
 Hacı İlyas mosque (1330), 112
 Miletus (Balat)
 pottery, 338
 see also Balat
 military service, collective, 216
 mineral resources
 Anatolia, 240–2, 254
 Balkans, 255
 Minnet Bey, Tatar leader, 149
 Minnetoğlu Mehmed Bey, Ottoman governor
 of Bosnia, 150
 mint towns, 100
 mints
 at Bursa (1327), 121
 Milas, 111
 moneyers in Anatolia (1299–1300), 102
 Sivas, 55, 58
 Söğüt, 118
 Turkoman, 246
 Mistra, rebellion, 44
 Mitylene (Lesbos), island, 13, 110
 Venetian attacks on, 16
 Modon (Methone), Venetian rule over, 23, 41
 Moglena, Pechenegs settled in, 139, 143n.13
 Moldavia, Republic of, Gagauz people in,
 142
 Molendino, Benefatio de, Venetian tax
 farmer, 257
 Molla Vaciđ (d. 1434), *müderris* (teacher), 300
 monasteries
 Ak Manastır (Deyr-i Eflatun), 405
 Athonite, 142
 Balkans, 147, 178
 Orthodox Christian, 186
 Monastir *see* Manastir
 Monemvasia, fortress, 32
 Möngke, election as Great Khan, 56
 death (1259), 57
 Möngke Temür, Brother of Abaqa, 72
 Mongols
 1243 invasion, 3, 27, 51–3
 administrative legacy, 98–9
 and Armenians, 389
 change of capitals, 99
 collapse of authority in Galatia, 122
 conversion to Islam, 64, 99, 365
 direct rule in Anatolia, 81–93, 102, 359
 and dissension within Ilkhanid state,
 73–81

- and dissolution of Ilkhanid state, 97,
125–6
effect on land tenure, 237
and ethnic mix in Anatolia, 365
extent of control in Anatolia, 92
formation of Ilkhanid state, 57–64
gradual settlement of, 369
indifference to towns, 100
influence on beyliks, 116
and lack of sources, 353, 408
officials and bureaucracy, 98–9
policy towards non-Muslims, 389–90
rebellions against central authority, 81
relations with Seljuks of Rum, 62–3, 66–7,
72–3, 374
and rise of Ottomans, 45, 102
role of military commanders, 99
ruler's military retinue, 192
and successors to Genghis Han, 53–7
under Abaqa Han, 64–73
see also Ilkhanid state; Timur
- Monophysite Jacobites, 361, 382
in eastern Anatolia, 361
- Morea
Byzantine base in (1261), 142
Ottoman advance to, 130
- Morea, Despotate of the, 32, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48
- mosques, 279–97
Byzantine influence, 164
colonnaded courtyard, 181
congregational, 283–94
aisled, 283–6
'basilical', 286–8
hypostyle, 288–90
development of layout, 292–4
domes, 288–90, 318
half-dome, 183
mescid (small mosque), 161, 164, 177
mescids in villages, 369
minarets, 165, 172, 181, 294, 340
single-domed, 163–4, 165, 170–1, 177, 279–83
porticos, 281–3
Ulu Cami type, 171, 175
vakıfs for, 379
zaviye-mosques, 188
zaviye-T-plan, 160, 177, 180, 294–7
- Mosul, conquest by Kılıç Arslan I, 358
- Mücireddin Mehmed, Mongol agent, and
naibüs-saltana, 72, 73, 83, 87, 98
Mongol emir of Rum, 75, 77
naib in Anatolia, 80, 86
- Mudurnu, Yıldırım Bayezid mosque, 170
- Müeyyedüddin el-Cendi, Sufi, 395
- Muhammad, puppet Ilhan, 94
- Muhammad Talakani (d. 1217), scholar, 384,
414
- Muhammed b. Ebubekr, craftsman, 348
- Muhammed b. Gazi-i Malatyavi, *vezir* and
poet, 416
muhasebe (accounts), for towns, 367
- Mühezzibeddin, Seljuk *vezir*, 54, 60
- Mühezzibeddin Mesud, grandson of the
Pervane, 87
- Muhi al-Din ibn Arabi *see* Muhieddin Ibn
Arabi
- Muhieddin Ibn Arabi, Andalusian Sufi mystic,
359, 389, 389n.85, 390
Fusus al-Hikam, 395
al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya, 395
and *vahdet-i vücud* (monism), 394–6
- mühimme* registers, 403
- muhtesib*, market official, 245
- Mu'in al-Din Süleyman *see* Muineddin
Süleyman
- Muineddin Süleyman
execution (1277), 70
and Mamluks, 67
as patron, 65–6, 100
Pervane, 64–70
supporter of Rükneddin, 58, 60, 63
- mules, for army transport, 220
- Murad, son of Orhan, *sancak* of Bursa (1331),
198
- Murad I, Ottoman ruler (1362–89), 37, 38, 112,
125, 126–9, 360
capture of Thessalonike (1387), 39
complex and tomb at Bursa, 163, 276
death of, 42, 128
mosque in Bursa, 168
and occupation of Balkans, 126–8
as patron, 319
sources for, 125
and Theodore I Palaeologos, 41–2
treaty with Genoa (1387), 253, 261, 263
- Murad II, Ottoman ruler (1421–51), 2, 46–8,
133, 134–7
abdication, 136
bridge at Skopje, 178
buildings in Bursa, 276–7
buildings in Edirne, 179, 190, 292
as patron of arts/buildings, 319
rebellions, 135, 175
reconstruction of Filibe, 176
reforms to *timar* system, 200
at Thessalonike, 188, 244
tomb in Bursa, 310

- Musa, son of Bayezid, 45, 45n.201, 132–3, 134
 Musa Çelebi, 174, 320
 attack on Yambol, 165
 mosque in Edirne, 288
müsellems (mounted infantry), 213
 Mushanov, Nikola, architect, 158, 187
 Muslims, 142, 364
 intermarriage with Christians, 364
 relations with Christians, 400
 see also Islam; Shi'ism; Sufism; Sunniism
 Mustafa
 Turkish pretender, 46, 133, 135, 175
 and *yaya* system, 213
 Mustafa, brother of Murad II, 47, 135
 Mustafakemalpaşa (Kirmastı), tomb of Lala
 Şahin Paşa, 309
 Mut, tomb of Hocendi or Büyük Türbe, 306
 Muzaffereddin b. Abdülvahid b. Süleyman,
 craftsman, 347
 Muzaffereddin Yavlak Arslan, 413
 Myriocephalon, battle of (1176), 20, 358
 Mystras, fortress, 32
- Nabşi, Mongol commander, 62, 63
 Nakkaş Ali, architect, 320, 343
 Nakşibendiye, *tarikât*, 393n.91
 Naseddin-i Sicistani, *Munis al-Awarif*, 416
 Nasir al-din Tusi, *Camasname*, 419
 al-Nasir Muhammad, Mamluk sultan, 92,
 94
 Nasiredin Hoca, son of Yavlak Arslan,
 mustaufi, 77
 Nasiredin-i el-Sicistani, *Daqayiq al-Haqaiyiq*,
 421
 Nasırı, son of Rükneddin el-Urmevi, dervish,
 417
 Nasreddin Tusi, scholar, 414
 Nauplia, city of, 42
 Nauplia, Gulf of, Venetian naval victory over
 Genoa (1263), 29
 Navarre, mercenaries, 40, 42
 Necmeddin Alp, Artukid ruler, 388
 Necmeddin Kübra, Sufi mystic, 392
 Necmeddin Razi (Daye), Sufi mystic, *Mirsad*
 al-'Ibad, 391, 392, 421
 Nefise Sultan, wife of Alaeddin Bey, 298
 Negroponte *see* Euboea
 Neri Acciaiuoli, lord of Corinth, 40, 40n.173,
 41, 42
 Neşri, Mevlana, chronicler, 149, 150, 151, 187
 and Ottoman architecture, 274
 Nestorianism, 364, 382
 Nicaea *see* İznik
- Niğde
 Ak Medrese, 298
 Alaeddin Camii, 286
 Gündoğdu Türbesi, 308
 Sungur Bey mosque, 171, 268, 286, 290, 316,
 348
 tomb of Hüdavend Hatun, 268, 306
 Turkoman palace at, 311
 Nikaia *see* İznik
 Nikephoros III Botaneiates, Byzantine
 emperor (1078–81), 11, 13
 Nikephoros Gregoras, chronicler, 143
 Nikola, Saint, 402
 Nikomedia *see* İznik
 Nikopolis, battle of (1396), 43, 130, 217, 251, 288
 Niksar, Danişmend Turks in, 357
 Nilüfer Hatun, wife of Orhan, as patron, 320
 Niş (Niš), Ottoman advance to, 127
 Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, Ottoman chronicler,
 147
 Nizameddin Ahmed Erzincani, poet, 416
 Nizameddin Hurşid, Pervane and poet, 416
 Nizameddin Yahya Faryumadi, Khurasani
 bureaucrat, 87, 98
 Nizami Genjevi, poet, 417
nökör/nöker (Mongol warrior leader), 193
 nomad economy, 230–4
 trade, 231, 232, 369
 nomadism, move away from, 107, 367–9, 371
 nomads
 encampments, 231, 231n.18
 numbers of, 363
 seasonal settlement, 369
 state control over, 237
 warfare, 192
 see also Oğuz nomads; Uz
- Normans
 attacks on Byzantium, 18
 in Byzantine army, 10
 capture of Bari, 11
 expansion of, 8, 16
 sack of Thessalonike, 21
 and Venice, 12
 Novobrdro, Serbian silvermine town, 162
 Nureddin b. Caca, 68
 Nureddin Mahmud b. Zengi, 414
 Nymphaion (Nif, Kemalpaşazade)
 treaty of (1214), 25
 treaty of (1261), 28
- Oba, Turkoman palace at, 311
ocak (infantry units), 213, 214, 216
 occult, writings on, 421

- Ögedei, son of Genghis Han, 53
 death (1241), 53
 extent of territory, 93
 rule in Anatolia, 53
- Ögedei, son of Shiktur Noyan, 89
- Öğuz nomads, 100, 135, 193, 356, 368
 as Byzantine mercenaries, 362
 conversion to Islam, 361
see also Turkomans
- Ohrd, Ottoman advance to, 127
- Öljeitü, Mongol sultan of Ilkhan (1304–16), 86,
 89, 268n.2
 and Shi'i Islam, 386
 and taxation, 88
 and Turkomans, 88, 89
- Ömer b. Mezd, *Mecmu'at el-Neza'ir*, 417
- Ömer el-Ebheri (d. 1265), 384
- Onogurs, 138
- Orban, Hungarian inventor of cannon, 49,
 219, 241
- ordu* (Mongol court), Seljuk missions to, 57
- Orhan, Ottoman ruler (c.1324–62), 34, 36,
 120–4, 222n.129, 360
 and Balkans, 122–3
 as builder (in Bursa), 124, 160, 276, 317, 319
 marriage, 123
 relations with Genoa, 123, 263
 siege of Prusa (Bursa), 236
 and theological debate, 406
yaya (infantry), 196
- Ortaköy (Ivajlovgrad), Ottoman *kaza*, 139
- Orthodox Church
 and Christians in Anatolia, 389, 404
 conversion of Bulgars (865), 139
 and Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439), 48,
 136
 monasteries, 186
 offers of union with Rome, 29, 30, 37, 47
 and separatist sects, 382
- Oruç Bey, as patron, 320
- Osman, Ottoman ruler (?–c.1324), 118–20, 267,
 360
 Byzantium and, 88
 establishment of markets, 245, 252
 expansion, 119
 military retinue/entourage, 194
 repopulation of towns, 244
 and trade with Bilecik (Bekloma), 232
- Osmançik, 80
 copper mines, 240
- Ottoman army, classical, 198–226
 archers, 207, 211, 213
 armourers, 210
 artillery corps, 209–10
 cavalry, 208–9
devşirme, 124, 126, 137, 206
 fortress garrisons, 210–11
 infantry, 121, 125, 221
 battle tactics
 and influence of holy war (*gaza*), 104
 janissary, 206–8
 marcher districts, 204–5
 military power, 119, 129, 226
 obligations of *timariots*, 201, 202–4
 peasant soldiers and militias, 211–17
 azabs, 211–12
 cerehors, 214–15
 martoloses, 216
 Vlachs, 215
 voynuks, 215
 yayas and *müsellems*, 212–13
 yürüks, 213–14
 salaried troops of the court, 217
 size of, 204
 supply and transport, 220
timar system, 199–202
 vassal states, 217
see also Ottoman army, early; Ottoman
 navy
- Ottoman army, early, 192–8
 administration and territorial division,
 197–8
 cavalry (*timariots*) (*timar eri* / *sipahis*), 197,
 199–202
 infantry, 196
 mounted, 194
 nomadic tradition, 192
 ruler's retinue, 192–4
timar system of provisioning, 196
- Ottoman beylik and Empire, 137, 269, 360
 absorption of other, 125–6
 administration, 121, 136
 annexation of Karasi, 122
 art and architecture, 274–7
 between Bayezid and Murad II, 131–4
 and conversions to Islam, 403
 deportations to Balkans, 149–52
 economy, 119–20
 effect of Timur's invasion, 45
 expansion to east, 122
 first expansion of, 119
 and intervention in Balkans, 122–3
 mass destruction of monuments after fall
 (twentieth century), 157
 Mehmed's campaign in Anatolia, 133
 Murad II's policy of aggression, 46–8

- Ottoman beylik and Empire (*cont.*)
 occupation of Balkans, 126–8
 presence in Mediterranean, 124
 protection of merchants, 259–61
 rebellions under Murad II, 135
 relations with Byzantium, 36, 49–50
 religious policy, 384
 rise of, 1–2, 102
 royal patrons, 319–20
 society, 3
 treaty with Byzantium (1403), 45, 132, 254
 treaty with Genoa (1387), 253, 263
 under Orhan, 120–4
 under Osman, 118–20, 267
see also Ottoman army; Ottoman navy;
 Ottoman Turks
- Ottoman navy, 3, 124, 223–6
 blockade of Constantinople (1453), 224
 deployment, 225
 development of, 223–4
 river fleet, 225–6
 sea battle (1416), 224
 shipboard artillery, 219
 shipbuilding and dockyards, 224
 size of, 224
- Ottoman Turks
 advance into Thrace, 37
 as Byzantine mercenaries, 144
 genealogy, 135
 historiography, 103–4
 and independence from Seljuks (1299), 118
 origins of in Anatolia, 118
 in Sangarios region, 31
 sources for, 106, 134
 Sunni Muslims, 120
see also beyliks; Ottoman beylik and Empire
- Öz, Tahsin, 327
- Pachymeres, George, Byzantine chronicler,
 118, 119, 143, 228
- Pađšah Hatun, wife of Geyhatu, 76
- paganism, in Anatolia, 381
- painting, 321–4
 architectural decoration, 322–4
 framed illustrations, 322
 illustrated manuscripts, 321–2
- palaces, 270, 311–13, 352
 Bulgar, 138, 178
- Palamas, Gregory, chronicler, 124
- Pamphylia
 beylik of Hamid, 109
 beylik of Teke in, 112
 Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
- Pannonia, 7
- pantheism, 395
- Paolo, Giovanni di
Madonna and Child, 332
Marriage of the Virgin, 331
- Paphlagonia, 24
 Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
- paša*, title of, 198, 204
- pastoralism, 231
 in beyliks, 117, 362
 Mongol, 62, 365
 nomadic Turks and Kurds, 53, 369
- patronage, 422
 for architecture, 318–20
 of poets, 415
- Paulicianism, 382
- Pechenegs, Turkic nomads, 139
 attacks on Constantinople, 13
 in Byzantine army, 10, 16
 as threat to Byzantium, 8, 16
- Peçin
 palace of Menteşeoğlu Orhan Bey, 270, 311
 Üçgöz (Karapaşa) Hanı, 314
- Pegolotti, merchant, 228
- Pelagonia, battle of (1259), 28, 32
- Pelagonian Plain, Macedonia, 154
- Pelekanon, battle of (1329), 121, 123, 194
- Peloponnese, Byzantine, 36, 39, 47
 Ottoman invasions, 42, 47, 48
see also Morea
- pencik*, recruitment of captives as janissaries,
 206
- Pera
 abandoned, 244
 Genoese settlement, 250, 263
 Turkish merchants in, 259
- Pergamon *see* Bergama
- Persia
 Anatolian links with, 101
 expulsion of Turkomans, 357
 fabrics from, 327
 raw silk from, 249, 326
 Sassanid Empire, 355
 Seljuks in, 356
 Sufism in, 390
 as threat to Byzantium, 6
 trade with, 228, 248
 Zoroastrianism, 381
- Peter, king of Cyprus, 264
- Peter IV of Aragon, 35
- Peter of Courtenay, emperor of
 Constantinople, 26
- Petrič, castle, near Varna, 152

- Pevsner, Sir Nikolaus, 182
 Philadelphia (Alaşehir), 24, 32
 Ottoman campaign (1390 and 1391), 39, 129
 silk production, 326
 Philanthropenos, Byzantine general, 251
 Philip II Augustus, king of France, 21
 Philip of Swabia, 22
 Philip of Tarentum, 33
 Philippopolis (Filibe, Plovdiv)
 architecture, 175–7, 185–8
 citadel of Yedi Kule (Heptapyrgion), 176
 destruction (1410), 176
 hamam, 185
 Hüdavendigar Murad Cami (Cumaya Cami), 175, 288
 İmaret, 186–7
 *külliy*e (religious and social complex), 185
 market, 250
 medrese, 185
 Meriç bridge, 185
 occupied by Barbarossa, 21
 Ottoman buildings, 274
 türbe of Şihabeddin Paşa, 185, 188
 Turks in, 127, 149, 176
 philosophy, 420
 Phocaea (Phokaea, Foça), 123
 alum production, 242
 Genoese in, 227, 263
 grain trade, 240
 Phrygia
 beylik of Germiyan in, 113
 Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
 Piccolomini, General, 178
 Pierre de Saint Superan, Navarrese mercenary, 40
 Pietro, Sano di, *Marriage of the Virgin*, 331
 Piloti, Emanuele, Cretan merchant, 228, 243
 Pippin, son of Charlemagne, 7
 piracy
 in Greek archipelago, 30
 Turkish, 41, 223, 233
 twelfth-century, 16
 Pirenne, Henri, 367
 Pisa
 Byzantium and, 16, 19
 import of Anatolian silk, 244
 Pisidia, beylik of Hamid, 109, 114
 place names
 Bulgaria, 152–3
 Cuman, 140
 Macedonia, 154
 Mongol, in Anatolia, 365, 369
 Slavic, in Thrace, 147
 Thessaly, 154
 Turkish, 368
 in Balkans, 139, 142
 villages, 366n.36, 368
 Pliska, Bulgar palace and 'Forbidden City', 138
 ploughs, 372
 Plovdiv *see* Philippopolis
 poetry, 415–19
 aims of, 417
 imitative (*nazire*), 417
 mesnevi style, 416
 and patronage, 415
 in Persian, 416
 in Turkish, 408, 416–19
 poets, honours and offices for, 415
 populations
 deportations to settle agricultural lands, 238
 early Turkic settlers in Balkans, 139, 143n.13
 mixed Muslim–Christian, in Thrace, 146
 Ottoman deportations to settle Balkans, 149–52
 of towns, 375
 of villages, 366
 see also tax registers
 ports
 trade through, 233, 239, 250
 see also Antalya; Balat; Sinop
 Pousgouse, Lake (Beyşehir Gölü), 49
 prices
 foodstuffs in Anatolia, 229
 for slaves, 251–2
 for Turkoman horses, 232
 prisoners of war, as janissaries, 206
 Propontis, coast of, 13
 Prousa *see* Bursa
 Psellos, Michael, 9

 Qa'an, Great *see* Genghis Han; Qubilai
 Qa'an, Great *see* Genghis Han; Qubilai,
 Qalawun, Mamluk sultan, 73
 Qaraqorum, Mongol centre, 54, 55
 Qubilai, Great Qa'an, 79
 Querini, Francesco, Venetian envoy, 262
 Qutqutu, grandson of Baiju, 61, 84
 Qutu, grandson of Baiju, 69

 Raffaelo Capello, merchant, 246
 Ramon Muntaner, Catalan chronicler, 143
 Rashid al-Din *see* Reşideddin
 al-Ravandi, *Rahat al-Sudur wa Ayat al-Surur*, 420
 Raymond of Antioch, 17

- Raymond of Poitiers, 17
Rebabname, poem, 416
 religion, 380–2
 in Anatolia, 66, 90
 changes under Mongols, 100
 Christian and Muslim symbiosis in
 Ottoman beylik, 121
 conversions and apostasy, 402–5
 of early Ottomans, 120
 ‘heretical’ churches in Anatolia, 355, 381
 intermarriage between Christians and
 Muslims, 364
 Monophysite Jacobites, in eastern
 Anatolia, 361, 382
 officials in towns, 376
 Ottoman institutions, 121
 teaching of in *medreses*, 412
 theological encounters between Islam and
 Christianity, 405–18
 see also Christianity; Islam; Manicheism;
 Orthodox Church; Rome, Church of
 Resideddin, head of *Divan* in Ilkhan, 87
 vezir, 90
 Reynald of Antioch, 19
 Rhodes, 47
 rivalry with Menteşe beylik, 111
 Turkish slave traders on, 259
 see also Hospitallers
 Rhodopes, Pechenegs in, 139
 Rhynakos (Orhaneli), battle of (1211), 25
 rice production, 372
 Richard I, Lionheart, 21
 Riefstahl, Rudolf, 277, 329
 Rifaiye, *tarikāt*, 390
 Roger II, king of Sicily
 ambitions against Byzantium, 18
 and emperor, 16
 and second crusade, 17
 Roger de Flor, Catalan Grand Company, 32
 Roman Empire, 6
 Christianity in, 355
 Romania, Bayezid’s campaign (1395), 130
 Romanos Diogenes, Byzantine emperor, 10
 defeat at Malazgirt (1071), 1, 10, 356
 Rome, Church of
 and Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439), 48,
 136
 missionaries to Anatolia, 359
 offers of union with Constantinople, 29, 30,
 37, 47
 Roussel of Bailleul, Frankish commander, 10,
 11
 Rovine, battle of (1395), 154
 Ruba’iyyat, 397
 Ruhi-i Edirnevi, chronicler, 182
 Rükneddin *see* Kılıç Arslan IV
 Rükneddin Geyumers (Melik Siyavuş), 72
 Rükneddin Mesud I (1116–56), Seljuk sultan,
 20n.73, 358, 414
 coins, 247
 Konya, 358, 414
 and revolt of Melik, 80
 Rükneddin Süleyman II, Seljuk sultan and
 poet, 415, 416
 protection for merchants, 260
 rebellion against Alexios Angelos, 234
 Rum, Seljuk province of, 3, 51
 administration, under Mongols, 80, 86
 extent of, under Mongols, 52
 as refuge for scholars and mystics, 100
 sale of *divani* (state) lands, 79
 uprisings against Mongols, 89
 Rumeli
 beylerbeylik of, 204
 deportation of Tatars to, 149
 deportation of *timar*-holders to and from,
 199
 slave markets, 250
 yaya units in, 213
 Rumeli Hisarı, fortress of, 48, 254
 Russia, 8, 48
 Byzantine influence, 8
 Sabbas Asidenos, 24
 sabre, curved (*kılıç*), 201
 Sa’d al-Daula Savaji, Jewish *vezir* in Rum, 77
 head of *Divan* in Ilkhan, 87
 Sadeddin el-Fergani, Sufi, 395
 Manahif al-’Ibad ila al-Ma’ad, 421
 Sadeddin Hamevi, Sufi, 392
 Sa’d-i Shirazi, poet, 417
 Sadreddin Konevi, Sufi mystic, 390, 395
 Tabsirat al-Mubtedi wa Tadhkirat
 al-Muntahi, 421
 Sadreddin Zanjani
 opposition to Geyhātu, 79
 as *sahib-i divan*, 83
 as *vezir*, 79, 80, 81
 Sahib Cemaleddin, *vezir*, Dastgirdani, 87
 Sahib Necmeddin, *vezir* in Anatolia, 80
 saint cults
 shared, 401
 and Sufi Islam, 391, 399
 Saint-Quentin, Simon de
 Dominican missionaries, 242, 244, 252, 359
 Historia Tartarorum, 365

- Şaladin (Salah al-Din), capture of Jerusalem, 21
 Salman Savaji, *Cemşid ü Hurşid*, 418
 Salona (Amphissa), 43
 salt mines, 240
Saltıkname epic, 403, 405
 Saltuk, *bey* of, Turkoman leader, 357
 Saltukid state, and Islam, 383
 Saltukids
 towns, 374
 Turkish language, 407
 Samağar Noyan, Mongol commander, 67, 71, 72, 76
 regime in Konya, 77, 78
 Samarkand, 266, 342, 343
 Samothrakia, A., 162
 Sampson, town of, 24
 Samsun, 87
 copper mines, 240
 market, 252
sancak (military district), 198, 377
 yaya and *müsellem*, 213
sancakbeyi, timariot commanders, 203–4
 Sangarios (Sakarya), Ottoman Turks in, 31
 Sangarios (Sakarya) River, 118, 119
 Santa Unio, treaty with Aydın, 261
 Santo-Siro, Nicolao de, Genoese merchant
 alum trade, 242
 tax farmer, 257
 Şarabdar Hasan Bey, buildings, 190
 Sarı Saltık Dede, dervish, 141, 368
 cult of, 402
 Sarimuddin Saruca Paşa, as *yayabaşı* of Rumeli, 212
 Sarmatians *see* Croats; Serbs
 Sarre, Friedrich, 277
 Saruhan
 architecture, 271
 and Byzantine civil war, 34
 deportations to Philippopolis, 149, 151
 independence, 27
 slave market, 250
 Saruhan, beylik of, 110
 and Genoa, 261
 Saruhanbeyli (Saran Bej, Septemvri), Thrace, 149
 Saruhanlı, Bulgaria, 153
 Sassan, emir, 236
 Sassanid Empire, Persia, 355
 Saulo, Bonifacio da, agent to Orhan, 263
 Savcı, son of Murad I, 38
 Schnitter, J. H., 185
 scholars, 413–14
 scholarship
 role of *medreses*, 411
 in Seljuk state, 383, 408
 see also education; intellectual life
 science
 literature of, 420
 teaching of, 412
 second crusade (1147–9), 17
 Selçuk Hatun
 as patron, 320
 Selçukname chronicle, 141
 wife of Abaqa, 68
 wife of Arghun, 68
 Selim I, sultan, 152
 Seljuk sultanate of Rum, 3, 11, 51, 98, 356–7
 administrative system
 compared with Mongols, 98–9
 rural, 371–2
 arts and culture, 65, 266, 278, 316, 351
 architectural influence
 glazed pottery, 336
 patronage of poetry, 415–16
 battle of Malazgirt (1071), 6
 compared with beyliks, 116–17
 economy
 annual repayment of debts, 60
 taxation, 252
 towns, 243
 establishment of caravansarys, 258
 expedition to Sudak, 254
 extent of, 118
 fragmentation of, 16, 54, 56, 99
 land tenure, 237
 lands of chief officers of state, 60
 maritime force in Black Sea, 25
 military organisation, 195, 197
 and Mongols, 54–7
 administrative system, 98–9
 defeat by, 53–4
 integrated into Ilkhanate, 63, 85, 86
 relations with, 55, 62–3
 tribute to, 254
 relations with Nicaea, 27
 religion
 mosques, 279, 283, 286
 religious foundations, 65
 and Sunni Islam, 357, 383
 tolerance of non-Muslims, 353
 as threat to Byzantium, 1, 9, 13
 trade treaties with Venice, 261, 262
 and Turkoman invasions, 70, 233, 357

- Şems-i Tebrizi, dervish, 393, 397
Maqalat, 421
- Şemseddin, of Konya, 77
- Şemseddin Ahmed Lakuşi, vezir in Rum, 77, 79, 83, 87, 89
- Şemseddin Cüveyni (Juvaini), Mongol *sahib-i divan* in Rum, 71
- Şemseddin İsfahanlı, Seljuk *vezir*, 54, 415
- Şemseddin Mehmed Fenari (d. 1431), as patron, 320
- Şemseddin Muhammed-i Isfahani, Sahib, poet, 415, 416
- Serbia, 16
 and battle of Kosovo (1389), 128
 expansion under Stefan Dušan, 35, 144
 as Ottoman vassal state, 217
 Ottomans and, 48, 136
 Turkish expansion into, 41
- Serbs, 6, 18
 defeated by Turks at Çirmen (1371), 38, 127
 relations with Byzantium, 21, 30, 31
- Şerefeddin Abdurrahman, *müstevisi*, 87
- Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, 70
 revolt of, 69
- Şerefeddin Müsafir, as tax collector, 88
- şerifs*, 376
- şeriyye sicilleri* (court registers), 367
- Serres, Macedonia, 43, 130
bedestan (covered market), 157, 164
 of Çandarlı İbrahim Paşa
 Eski Cami, 164
imaret/zaviye (soup kitchen/dervish lodge), 148, 159
 mosque of Mehmed Bey (1492), 164
 Ottoman settlements, 149, 150
 religious foundations, 148
- Seydişehir, Turkish town, 374
- Seyfeddin Bakharzi, Sufi, 392
- Şeyh Bedreddin, religious leader and rebel, 133–4, 406
- Şeyh Hasan, tomb in Sivas, 272
- Şeyh Hasan (Büyük), Celayird emir, 92, 94, 95
- Şeyh Hasan (Küçük), Çobanoğlu, 94, 273
- Şeyh Hızır, building of *zaviye* in Serres, 148
- Şeyh Kutbuddin, of Konya, 77
- Şeyhi (Yusuf Sinan), poet, 419
Harname, 419
Hüsrev ü Şirin, 419
- Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, scholar, 411
Kenz el-Kübera, 417
- şeyhs*, 376, 391
- Şeyyad Hamza, poet, 409, 418
Ahval-i Kıyamet, 418
Dasitan-i Sultan Mahmud, 418
Yusuf u Zeliha, 418
- Seyyid Burhaeddin Muhakkik-i Tirmizi, *Kitab al-Ma'arif*, 420
- seyyids*, 376
- Shafi'ism, 385
- Shahnames* manuscripts, 322, 335
- shamanism, Mongol, 368, 389
- Shams al-Din Juvaini *see* Şemseddin Cüveyni
- sheep, nomad herds, 231
- shield (*kalkan*), 201
- Shihab al-din Abu Hafs 'Umar al-Suhrawardi, 393
- Shihab al-din al-Suhrawardi (Suhrawardi-i Maqtul), Iranian philosopher, 359
Pertevname, 420
- Shi'ism
 in Anatolia, 4, 384, 386–7
 Imamiye (Twelver), 387
 Ismailis, 386, 387
- shipbuilding, Antalya, 243
- Sicily, 29
 fall of Angevins, 30
- siege warfare, 129, 195, 218, 222–3
 and need for infantry, 196
- siege engines, 222, 222n.129
- Turkoman, 235–6
- Siena, paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331
- Sigismund, king of Hungary, 43, 225
 crusade, 43
- Şihabuddin Paşa (Kula Şahin Paşa), buildings in Filibe, 185
- Siirt
 brass production, 243
 linen cloth, 243
- Şikari, chronicle of Karamanoğulları, 105
- silk industry, 243–4, 321, 324, 351
 brocades, 325, 327
- silk trade, 249, 327
 exports, 243–4, 326
- silver
 inlaid bowl, 321
 trade, 241
- silver mines, 91, 240
- Sinaneddin Ariz, chief adviser to Demirtaş, 90
- Sinanuddin Yusuf Paşa (Sinan Paşa), *beylerbey* of Rumeli, 179
- Sinop (Sinope), 25, 26, 373
 copper mines, 240

- David Komnenos as ruler, 24
 dynastic tomb of İsfendiyaroğlu, 271
 market, 252
 mosques
 Aslan Camii (1351–52), 271
 Fatih Baba Mescidi (1339–40), 271
 Kadı Camii (1364), 271
 Saray Camii (1375), 271
 Saray Mescidi, 279
 Ottomans and, 43
 port, 116, 358
 resettlement of, 258, 373
 Sipahi Bayezid, Turkish merchant, 259
 Sipehsalar Ferudun b. Ahmed, *Manağib-i Hadrat-i Khudavandigar*, 421
 Siraceddin el-Urmevi, scholar, 414
 Sirmium, Hungarian occupation, 21
 Sis, citadel, Mamluk siege (1320), 235
 Šišman dynasty, in Bulgaria, 140
 Sivas (Sebasteia), 65, 96, 373
 alum mine, 242
 besieged (1298), 84
 buildings, 272
 Ghazan Han's hospice, 272
 Gök Medresesi, 298
 Güdük Minare (1347) (tomb of Şeyh Hasan Bey), 272, 308, 316, 340
 international market, 248
 largest Mongol city, 93, 267
 Mengücek Turks in, 357
 Mongol pillaging around, 53
 population, 376
 sacked by Timur (1400), 97
 woollen goods, 243
Siyasetnames (mirrors for princes), 421
 Siyavuş (Melik Siyavuş, Rükneddin), brother of Gıyaseddin Mesud II, 78
 rebellions, 80, 81
 Skoplje (Üsküp)
 Alaca İmareti, 184, 187
 Ali Menteşeliü quarter, 151
 bedestan (covered market), 185
 bridge over Vardar, 178
 buildings of Murad II, 184–5
 fall to Ottomans (1391), 129
 fire (1689), 178
 han (Suli An, Sulu Han), 184
 külliye (religious and social complex), 184
 monastery of St George, 178
 mosque, 178
 Ottoman settlements, 149, 151–2
 restoration of Ottoman buildings, 158
 Serbian centre, 144
 slave market, 250
 slaves
 taken in Turkoman raids, 233–4
 taken in war, 251–2
 trade in, 250–2
 Slavs, 7
 in Balkans, 12, 138
 settled in Asia Minor, 6
 Smerderevo, Serbia, 217
 Smyrna *see* İzmir
 society, 365–7
 Sofia, capital of *beylerbeylik* of Rumeli, 204
 under Ottomans, 128
 Söğüt
 early Ottoman settlement at, 118
 tomb of Ertuğrul Gazi, 309
 Sökmen II, Ahlat ruler, 388
 Şop, ethnic group, 139, 154n.51
 Sözen, Metin, 278
 Sozopolis (Uluborlu), retaken by Byzantium, 37
 Spiridon, Saint, 402
 Sratsimir dynasty, Cuman origins of, 140
 Stanimaki, Greek Christian settlement, 176
 Stara Zagora (Eski Zağra, Zağra Eskihişar, Béroé), 140
 Eski Cami, 170
 Stefan Dušan, king of Serbia (1331–55), 33, 35, 36, 37, 144
 Stefan Lazarević, Serbian despot, 45, 217
 Stefan Prvovenčani, king of Serbia, 327
 Stephen of Blois, 15
 Stipion (Stiponje), Bulgaria, 167
 stone, for building, 316, 317
 stucco, relief carved, 317
subaşı/amir/zaim, 197
 political power of, 204
 yayabaşıs as, 212
 Sudak, Crimea, Seljuk expedition, 254
 Sufism
 and *ahilik*, 375, 375n.55
 among Turkomans, 386
 in Anatolia, 390–1
 and conversions to Islam, 404
 and education, 411
 ilahi aşk (divine love), 396
 influential Sufis, 394–8
 Mongols and, 391
 and popular Islam, 399
 prose works, 420–1
 socio-religious foundations, 379
 Sunni tolerance of, 384

- Sufism (*cont.*)
tarikats, 376, 380, 390
 and theological debate, 405
 in towns, 390, 393
 and use of Turkish language, 408, 409, 410, 411
vahdet-i vücud (monism), 394–6
see also dervishes
- Süge, prince, in western Iran, 82
- Sülemiş, grandson of Baiju, 61, 82
 revolt (1298–99), 80, 84, 86, 102
- Süleyman, son of Bayezid I, 132–3
 Emir of Edirne, buildings, 159, 170, 171–2
 relations with, 45
- Süleyman I (1081–92), Seljuk sultan, 13, 357
- Süleyman I (the Magnificent), Ottoman ruler (1520–66), 163
 census (1528–30), 148–9
 and mosque at Skopje, 178
- Süleyman Çelebi, mosque in Edirne, 288
- Süleyman Han, Cobanid puppet governor, 95
- Süleyman İsfendiyaroğlu
 copper trade, 241, 246, 247
- Süleyman Paşa, son of Orhan, 36, 123, 145, 197
 conquest of Ferencik, 147
 as patron, 320
- Süleyman Paşa, Turkoman from Kastamonu, 89
- Süleymanşah, ruler of Eşrefoğulları, 91
- Süleymanşah, ruler of Germiyan, 270, 300, 411
- Sultan Veled, son of Celaleddin Rumi, 76, 88, 393, 416
Ma'arif, 421
- sultans, place in battle, 221
- Sultanşah, son of Baltu, 90
- Şumnu (Şumen), Bulgaria, 152
- Sungur Çavuş Bey, governor of Philippopolis, 176
 as builder, 177
- Sunniism, 120, 187, 384–5
 Hanefi branch, 385, 413n.137
 in Seljuk sultanate, 357, 383
 under Mongols, 100
- Suriyanis, Syriac-speaking Christians, 361
- Sutai, Mongol commander, 86
- swords, 194
 cuirasses (Christian), 218
- Syria
 cultural influence, 182
 Hülegü's campaign in, 59, 61
 Mongol raid (1271), 62
 Timur's advance into, 43
 under Mamluks, relations with Ilkhanate, 52, 61, 63
 uprisings against Mongols, 89
- Szekler peoples, in Transylvania, origins of, 138
- Tabriz
 Karakoyunlu capital, 273
 Mongol court at, 59, 60
- Tabriz, Masters of, 342, 343, 345–6
- Taceddin Mutez, Mongol agent, 60, 65, 72, 98
medrese, 65
- Tadhkirat al-Awliya*, 410
- Taghachar, governor of Anatolia, 78, 81
 opposition to Geyhatsu, 79
- Taghai-Temür, Chinggisid prince in Khurasan, 94
- tahrir defters* (land registers), 142, 228, 237
 as evidence of Turkish colonization in Balkans, 155
 evidence of nomad settlement, 371
 and population estimates, 366
 Thrace, 145
 for towns, 367
- Taiju, son of Tuqu, 80, 81
- Tamara, princess of Georgia, 56
- Tana, Venetian trading settlement, 252
- Tancred, 15n.48
- tarikats*, 402
 Sufi, 376, 380, 390, 391–4
 in towns
 Sunni, 391
- Tarsus, recaptured by Byzantium, 17
- Taşköprüzade, Ottoman scholar, 170
Şaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya, 180
- Taştimur Hatayi (Tashtemür Khita'i), Mongol governor of Rum, 84
 governor in Anatolia, 80
- Tatar Pazarcık, Thrace, 149
- Tatars
 resettlement of, 149
 settlements near Edirne, 214
see also Golden Horde
- Taurus mountains, trade routes, 115
- Tavas, and Turkoman raiders, 235
- tax collection
 abuses by collectors, 20, 22
 Mongol system, 98, 101
- tax concessions
 for resettled captives, 238
 for trade, 262, 263

- tax exemptions
 for military service, 196, 210, 213, 214, 215, 216
 for supplying armies, 220
- tax farming, 75, 256–8
- tax registers, Ottoman
 Albania, 134, 156
 for Balkans, 148–9
 Bulgaria, 139
 Köprülü, 154
 Philippopolis (Filibe), 176
 Thessaly, 153
 Üsküp (1454), 151
 see also *defter-i mufassal*; *evkaf defter s (vakıf registers)*; *şer'iyye sicilleri (court registers)*; *tahrir defter s (land registers)*
- tax revenues, for Philippopolis *külliye*, 186
- taxation
 in Diyarbakır, 88
 in Konya, 77
 by Mongols, 71, 80, 83, 88, 98
 Nizameddin's regime, 87
 Seljuk sultanate, 65
- taxes
 avarız-i divaniye (extraordinary levies), 238
 Balkans, 255
 çift (on Muslim agricultural workers), 238, 255
 cizye (poll-tax on non-Muslims), 75, 238
 gümruk (customs), 255
 ispence (on Christian peasants in Balkans), 238, 255
 on land, 237–8
 on mineral resources, 240
 pre-Ottoman, 255
 rûsum (tithes), 238
 tamgha (Mongol commercial tax), 71
 on trade, 252–4
 on villages, 370
 on *yaya* land, 213
- Teke, beylik of, 109, 112, 267
 absorbed by Ottomans, 126
 independence, 45
- Tekirdağ (Rodosto), market, 250
- Tenedos, island, 36, 38
 offered to Venice, 38
- Terterid dynasty, in Bulgaria, 140
- Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* (Hadidi), 147
- textiles, 243, 324–8
 cotton, 326
 linen, 243
 trade, 249–50
 see also carpets and kilims; silk
- Thebes
 Catalans in, 32
 Navarrese in, 40
 taken by Roger of Sicily, 18
- theme system, 7
 decline of, 9
 revival of, 13
- Theobald of Cepoy, 33
- Theodor, Saint, 402
- Theodora, daughter of John Kantakouzenos, 34
- Theodore I Palaeologos, Byzantine emperor, 37, 41
 conflict with Venice, 42
 death (1407), 45
 and Turks, 41
 vassalage to Murad I, 42
- Theodore II, son of Manuel II, 45, 47
- Theodore II Laskaris (1254–8), 28
- Theodore Angelos (1215–24), Emperor of the Romans, 26
 and Nicaea, 27
- Theodore Laskaris
 Byzantine rule in Asia Minor, 24
 as emperor in Nicaea, 24–5, 26
- Theodore Mangaphas, Byzantine rebel, 24
- Theodosios, emperor (d. 391), 355
- Theologos (Selçuk)
 grain trade, 240
 markets, 250, 253
 wine imports, 239
- Thessalonike (Selanik), 9, 26
 buildings, 188–90
 Bey Hamamı, 158, 188
 Eski Cami, 188
 han, 146
 Pazar Hamamı (restoration), 158
 captured by Turks (1387), 41, 128
 fall of (1430), 2, 47, 136
 Norman sack of, 21
 Ottoman advance on, 128
 Ottoman siege and capture of (1430), 2, 47, 136, 218, 225
 Ottoman siege of (1411), 133
 recovered by Byzantium (1403), 132
 repopulation of, 244
 Zealot revolt, 34
- Thessaly, 41, 190
 Catalans in, 32
 Ottoman colonization, 153–4, 172
- third crusade (1189–92), 21, 363
- Thrace, 34
 Baldwin's lands in, 23, 24

- Thrace (*cont.*)
 Catalans in, 32
 destruction of, 145
 Ottoman advance into, 123
 Ottoman settlement of, 145
 Pecheneg raids, 16
 Turkish settlers in, 143–5
- timar* system, 196
 civil holders of *timars*, 199
 deportation of *timar*-holders between
 Anatolia and Rumeli, 199
 duties of timariots, 200
gulam recruits to, 200, 202
 income of *timars*, 202
 obligations, 201, 202–4
 status of *sipahis*, 200
 taxation, 255
timar-holder *sipahis*, 199–202
 weaponry, 201
see also sancak>
- Timur
 advance into Syria, 43
 and battle of Ankara (1402), 2, 45, 130
 and beyliks, 109, 113, 114
 campaign in Anatolia, 132, 230n.11
 cultural influence, 266, 343
 and Ottoman settlements in Balkans, 150,
 155
 sack of Sivas (1400), 97
- Timurtaş, Mongol governor, 114
 and beylik of Hamid, 114
- tin, imported, 242
- Tire
 Aydınoğlu Mehmed Bey Camii (1326–27),
 270
bedestan, 313
 Hafsa Hatun mosque, 270
 Karahasan Camii, 281
 Kazirzade mosque, 279
 tomb of Süleyman Şah b. Gazi Mehmed
 Bey (1349–50), 270
 Ulu Cami, 288
 Yahşi Bey mosque, 180, 324
- Tirhala, *defter* (1454–55), 199
- Tirhala, Greece, Christian *timar*-holders, 199
- Tirnovó
 Bulgarian palace, 178
hamam, 178
 Ottoman buildings, 178–9
- Toda'un, Mongol commander, 68, 69
- Tokat
 Danişmend Turks in, 357
 as Ilkhanid city / centre, 267
- Nureddin b. Sentimur Türbesi, 308
 Pervane's *hanekah* in, 65
 pre-Ottoman *zaviye*, 160
 seized by İzzeddin, 58
 under Ilkhanids, 268
- Toluids, 57
- tombs and graves (*türbes*), 162, 163, 305–11
 cylindrical shafts, 307
 domed (canopy) type, 305
 open canopy, 170
 polygonal shafts, 305–8
 porches, 306
 of saints, 399, 402
 square, 308–10
 tower type, 305
see also Bursa; *türbes*
- Tondrakism, 382
- topçı* (artillery), 209
- toponyms *see* place names
- Tourkopouloi (baptized Turks), in Byzantine
 service, 143
- tovcas*, raider officers, 205
- towns, 372–5
 administration, 374–5
 architecture, 267–77
 Byzantine, 373
 decline of Seljuk, 374
 destruction of, 243
 ethnic mix in, 375
 fortified (*kastron*), 373
 high Sufism in, 390, 393
 industries, 243
 market buildings, 245
 as markets, 243, 373
 new Turkish, 374
 non-Muslims in, 383
 planning, 274
 population, 375
 repopulation of, 244, 258
 Roman-Byzantine, 372–3
 separate Muslim and non-Muslim
 mahalles, 373, 376
 sources, 366–7
 Turkoman settlers in, 363
see also caravansarys
- trade
 between nomads and sedentary
 population, 232, 369
 beylik of Aydın, 111
 beyliks, 109–10, 116, 117
 bills of exchange, 248
 caravansarys, 258–9
 cash for, 248

- coastal beyliks, 112
- international markets, 248–50
- with Latin states, 228–9
- manipulation of markets, 263–4
- in metals, 241–2
- routes from Konya, 115
- Seljuk, 358
- slaves, 250–2
- taxes on, 252–4
- Turkish merchants, 259–61
- see also* exports; imports; merchants
- Trailles, fall, to Menteşe, 236
- Transoxiana, 363
 - cities, 376
 - Sufism in, 390
 - Sunni Islam in, 385
- travel
 - disruption of, 234
 - freedom of, 109
- Trebizond (Trabzon), 13
 - Alexios Komnenos as ruler, 24
 - annexation by Theodore Laskaris, 25
 - Byzantine ‘beylik’ of, 116
 - Christian kingdom of, 52
 - survival of, 103
 - trade, 252
- tribute
 - gifts of silk, 325
 - to Ilkhanid court, 60, 68
 - paid to Mongols, 54, 98, 229, 254
- Trikkala, western Thessalian plain, 172
- Tübingen, Ilkhan silver *dirhem* at, 118
- tüfenkçi* (gunner unit), 219
- Tugancuk, 91
- Tuna province, Muslim Turks (nineteenth century), 142
- Tunisia
 - French crusade against, 30
 - Great Mosque of Qairawan, 290
- Tuqu, son of the Celayir İlge Noyan, 68, 69, 78
- Turahan, Ottoman commander, 47
- Turan, Osman, 383
- türbes* *see* tombs and graves
- Turhan Bey, Gazi, buildings in Thessaly, 190
- Turin, treaty of (1381), 38
- Turkic peoples
 - ancestor cult, 163
 - in Balkans, 138–43
- Turkish emirates *see* beyliks
- Turkoman revolt (1277–8), 70–1
- Turkomans
 - and agriculture, 234–40
 - effect of raids on, 234–7
 - pastoralism, 53
 - economic approaches, 265
 - established in Anatolia, 356–8
 - leaders as shamans, 368
 - marcher lords under Ottomans, 126, 128, 130, 135
 - and Mongols, 64, 89, 359
 - nomad economy, 230–4
 - numbers of settlers, 362
 - raids against Mongols, 79
 - as threat to Mongols in Anatolia, 69–71, 88, 100
 - urban settlers, 363, 376
 - westward move into Anatolia, 230, 361
 - yigit* (military retinue), 193
- Turks
 - alps* (warrior leaders), 193
 - in Balkans, 4
 - co-existence with inhabitants, 400
 - culture, 400–5
 - earlier settlers, 363–4
 - and landholdings, 237
 - as merchants, 259–61
 - perception of economic destruction, 227–8
 - raids on Byzantine territories, 13, 20, 25, 233–4
 - rebellions against central administration, 368
 - settlement of nomads, 367–9
 - state policy towards non-Muslims, 387–90
 - tribal leaders, 368
 - Turkification and imposition of Islam, 360, 364
 - urban migrants, 363, 376
- Turks, Inner Asian, *kagan*’s military retinue, 192
- Tzympe, Gallipoli, Ottoman occupation (1352), 36, 145
- uc* (marcher districts), 204
- Uighurs, 192, 364
- ulema*
 - in Anatolia, 384
 - and heresy and superstition, 399
 - as patrons, 319, 320
 - teachers in *medreses*, 412, 413
 - in towns, 376
- Ulu Arif Çelebi, 393, 394
- Ulubad
 - alum production, 242
 - Ottoman seizure of, 121

- Uluborlu *see* Burğlu
 al-'Umari, chronicler, 92, 106, 228
 on alum mine, 242
 economic data, 229, 240
 on nomad herds, 231
 on Orhan's army, 196
 on silks, 325
 on weights and measures, 246
 on Yakub b. Ališir, 113
 Umur Paşa, emir of Aydın, 33, 105, 111
 in Balkans, 123, 144, 147
 at Birgi, 270
 captives, 251
 as patron, 320
 Ünal, Rahmi Hüseyin, 278
 uniforms, military, janissaries, 208
 Urbai Hatun, daughter of Berke Han, wife of İzzeddin, 72
 as wife of Mesud, 77
 Urban II, Pope, and first crusade, 14
 Urban IV, Pope, 29
 Urfa, town, 374
 Ürgüp, Christians in, 405
 see also Damsa Köyü
 Uroš, king of Serbia, 28
 Urquhart, D., 153
 Uruç Paşa, son of Timurtaş, 169
 Uruqtu, Mongol commander, 69
 Uşak, Holbein carpets from, 336
 Üsküp *see* Skoplje
 Usta Müsliheddin, architect of Great Mosque
 at Edirne, 182
 Uz, Turkic nomads, 9, 139
 in Byzantine army, 10

vahdet-i vücud (monism), 394–6, 398
vakıfname/vakfiyes (trust deeds of religious foundations)
 for *bedestans*, 313
 Seljuk, 228
 as source material, 377, 378
vakıfs (pious endowments)
 evkaf defters (registers), 367
 foundation charters, 148
 and Islamization, 383
 mechanism, 377
 for *medreses*, 412
 for mosques, 379
 official documents from, 104
 in Ottoman beylik near Söğüt, 120
 Ottoman period, 379
 Thessaly, 173
 in towns, 377–80
 types, 378
 of Ulu Cami in Edirne, 172
 Van, Lake, Mongol advance to, 53
 Van, town of, 374
 Varna, battle of (1444), 48, 137, 152, 190, 221
 Vaspurkan, Byzantine annexation, 7
 Vatopedi, Athonite monastery, 142
 Vefaiye, *tarikat*, 384, 392
Velayetname-i Hacı Bektaş, 404, 405
 Venetians, as tax farmers, 257
 Venice, 228
 attack on Aegean islands, 19
 in Balkans, 33
 and capture of Constantinople, 22–3
 and Chioggia War, 38
 counterfeit coinage, 247
 and fourth crusade, 22
 import taxes in Anatolia, 253
 loss of Constantinople (1261), 28
 mercantile influence, 26, 35
 and Nicaea, 25
 and Ottoman navy, 224
 Ottoman war (1423–30), 224
 in Peloponnese, 41
 relations with Byzantium, 12, 16, 18, 19, 29
 relations with Genoa, 27, 35
 relations with Ottomans, 45, 46, 130, 136
 renewal of commercial privileges (1302), 31
 trade, and grain trade, 240
 trade treaties with Seljuks, 261, 262
 trade with Turks, 262
 treaty with Genoa (1232), 27
 treaty with Navarrese (1387), 41
 Verria (Karaferiye, Verroia)
 Ottoman conquest of (1387), 150
 Seljuk Turks in, 141
 Vidin
 mosque, 177
 North Bulgarian principality, 140
vilayet (territorial unit), 197
 villages
 fortification of, 236
 markets, 369
 origins of, 365
 popular Sufism in, 390
 Sunniism in, 385
 and villagers, 370–2
 Vira *see* Ferencik
 Vize, castle of, *mescid*, 190
 Vize, Thrace, Fatih Cami, 159

- vojnici (Balkan Slav lesser nobility), 215
 Vryonis, Speros, 403
- warfare
 akıncıs (raiders), 205
 at battle of Ankara (1402), 130
 at battle of Nikopolis (1396), 130
 at battle of Varna (1444), 137
 entrenchments, 221
 field battles, 220–2
 military resources, 107–8
 nomadic tradition, 192
 Ottoman, 220–6
 revenue allotments to fund army, 129
 ruler's 'military retinue', 192–4
 sedentary, 107, 121
 siege, 129, 196, 218, 222–3
 Turkoman, 235–6
 Turkoman burnt earth tactics, 234
 Wagenburg-tactic, 218, 221
 see also Ottoman army
- weapons
 armament, 217–19
 artillery, 49, 218–19
 firearms, 218–19
 imported, 219n.119, 241, 241n.99
 janissaries, 208
 Ottoman, 194
 of timariots, 201
 war-axes, halberds and pick-axe (*kükünk*), 218
- Weigand, T., 338
- weights and measures, 229, 245–6
- William I of Sicily (1154–66), 18
- William II of Sicily (1166–89), 19
- William II Villehardouin, 30
- William of Rubruck, tax farm on alum, 257
- William of Tyre, 235n.46, 252
- William of Villehardouin, of Achaia, 28
 chronicler of Fourth Crusade, 147
- wine production, Anatolia, 239, 372
- wine trade, 239
- Wittek, Professor Paul, 103
- Wladislaw Jagiello, king, Crusade of Varna (1444), 190
- women
 political intrigues in Anatolia, 74
 as royal patrons, 319, 320
- wood
 for buildings, 317
 in decoration, 318
- woodcarving, 346–51
 craftsmen, 347–8
- inlays, 346
 reliefs, 347
 tongue and groove construction (*kündekari*), 347
- Yabanlu Pazarı, market, 369
- Yahşi Bey, son of Murad I, as patron, 320
- Yakub b. Alishir, beylik of Germiyan, 113, 300, 411
- Yakub Çelebi, son of Murad I, as patron, 320
- Yakub Paşa, Turkish commander, 43
- Yambol, Bulgaria
 bedestan (covered market), 157
 Eski Cami, 165–6
 Old Mosque, 158
 Ottoman siege of (1370), 165
- Yarıcani, *Karamanoğulları Şahnamesi*, 417
- yaya* (infantry), 212–13
 archers, 207, 213
 conversion to *müsellem* (mounted infantry), 213
 and janissaries, 206
 recruitment of, 212
- Yazd, Seljuks of, 86
- Yazıcızade Ali, translator, 410
- Yazıçoğlu Ali, Ottoman scholar, 135, 141
- Yazid I, Ummayyad caliph, 387
- Yazidi, 361
- Yazidism, 361, 387
- Yeni Han, on Tokat–Sivas road, 316
- Yenice-i Karasu, Ottoman tax register and census (1528), 149
- Yenice-i Vardar
 hamam, 166
 Ottoman town, 159
- Yenişehir, 120
- Yenişehir (Larissa)
 imaret, 173
 mosque, 172–3
 Ottoman colony, 153
- Yiğit Bey, Paşa
 family of, *uc* status, 205
 at Skopje, 151, 184
- Yozgat, district, Mongol settlement, 365
- Yunus Emre, Sufi poet, 397–8, 408, 417
 Divan, 398
 Risalat al-Nushiyye / Risaletü'n-Nushiyye, 398
- yürüks* (nomadic Turks), 213–14
- settlements in Macedonia, 154, 213
- Yusuf b. Fakih, craftsman, 348
- Yusuf b. Said el-Sicistani, scholar (d. 1241–2), 384, 414

Index

- Zaccaria family, merchants, 242
Zachariadou, Elisabeth, 141
Zagora, Thrace, 150
Zagora (Zağra Eskihisar)
 Eski Cami, 170, 281
Zahhak Enthroned, 335
Zakynthos, Norman occupation, 21
zaviyes, 188, 259, 297, 377
 Bursa, 160, 276
 Edirne, 295
 İznik, 294
 Karaman, 269
 Manisa, 271
 Tokat, 160
 see also imarets
Zibaldone da Canal, Venetian merchant, 246
Zichne, Macedonia, 141, 151
Ziyaret Pazarı, market, 369
Ziyaüddin Mahmud Hatiroğlu, 69
Zoroastrianism, 381